U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service

CMP-SPRCM-76-11

SELECTIONS FROM PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA MAGAZINES

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL
HONG KONG, B.C.C.

APRIL 1976

U.I.C.C.
JUN 18 1976
LIBRARY

KEEP UP TO DATE

Between the time you ordered this report—which is only one of the hundreds of thousands in the NTIS information collection available to you—and the time you are reading this message, several *new* reports relevant to your interests probably have entered the collection.

Subscribe to the **Weekly Government Abstracts** series that will bring you summaries of new reports *as soon as they are received by NTIS* from the originators of the research. The WGA's are an NTIS weekly newsletter service covering the most recent research findings in 25 areas of industrial, technological, and sociological interest—invaluable information for executives and professionals who must keep up to date.

The executive and professional information service provided by NTIS in the **Weekly Government Abstracts** newsletters will give you thorough and comprehensive coverage of government-conducted or sponsored research activities. And you'll get this important information within two weeks of the time it's released by originating agencies.

WGA newsletters are computer produced and electronically photocomposed to slash the time gap between the release of a report and its availability. You can learn about technical innovations immediately—and use them in the most meaningful and productive ways possible for your organization. Please request NTIS-PR-205/PCW for more information.

The weekly newsletter series will keep you current. But *learn what you have missed in the past* by ordering a computer **NTISearch** of all the research reports in your area of interest, dating as far back as 1964, if you wish. Please request NTIS-PR-186/PCN for more information.

WRITE: Managing Editor
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161

Keep Up To Date With SRIM

SRIM (Selected Research in Microfiche) provides you with regular, automatic distribution of the complete texts of NTIS research reports *only* in the subject areas you select. SRIM covers almost all Government research reports by subject area and/or the originating Federal or local government agency. You may subscribe by any category or subcategory of our WGA **(Weekly Government Abstracts)** or **Government Reports Announcements and Index** categories, or to the reports issued by a particular agency such as the Department of Defense, Federal Energy Administration, or Environmental Protection Agency. Other options that will give you greater selectivity are available on request.

The cost of SRIM service is only 45¢ domestic (60¢ foreign) for each complete microfiched report. Your SRIM service begins as soon as your order is received and processed and you will receive biweekly shipments thereafter. If you wish, your service will be backdated to furnish you microfiche of reports issued earlier.

Because of contractual arrangements with several Special Technology Groups, not all NTIS reports are distributed in the SRIM program. You will receive a notice in your microfiche shipments identifying the exceptionally priced reports not available through SRIM.

A deposit account with NTIS is required before this service can be initiated. If you have specific questions concerning this service, please call (703) 451-1558, or write NTIS, attention SRIM Product Manager.

This information product distributed by

NTIS U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, Virginia 22161

CMP-SPRCM-76-11

中华人民共和国杂志选译

Selections from People's Republic of China Magazines

American Consulate General
Hong Kong

No. 867-868
April 20-26, 1976

This edition is printed in the United States of America for dissemination in the Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Mediterranean, and the west coast of Africa from material produced by the American Consulate General, Hong Kong. All queries concerning this edition should be sent to:

National Technical Information
Service (152.12)
U.S. Department of Commerce
Springfield, Virginia 22151

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Hung-ch'i, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

Page

Beat Back the Right Deviationist Wind to Reverse Verdicts on Health Front - by Miao Yü (p. 5) 2

A General Program for Capitalist Restoration - by Ch'eng Yüeh (p. 12) 10

Criticize the Slavish Comprador Philosophy - by Fang Hai (p. 21) 20

The Revisionist Organizational Line Must Be Criticized - by Pai Shan (p. 27) 27

No One Is Allowed To Obliterate the Difference Between Socialism and Capitalism - by Chin Chih-pai (p. 32) 33

PRICES SUBJECT TO CHANGE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

Page

Actively Participate in Struggle To Hit Back at the Right Deviationist Wind to Reverse Verdicts (p. 37) 38

Communists Must Work for the Interests of the Vast Majority of People - by Yüeh Hai (p. 40) 42

Why Are Capitalist Roaders Afraid of Criticizing Water Margin? - by Yen Feng (p. 45) 47

There Is No Future in Going Backward - by Kan Ko (p. 48) 51

Marxism and Natural Science - by Hsin Feng (p. 53) 57

We Must Never Take the White-and-Expert Road (p. 59) 64

In Learning from Tachai, We Must Take Class Struggle as Key Link - by Lu Yang (p. 63) 69

The Battle Song of Independence and Self-Reliance - by Hung Sung (p. 69) 76

The Education and Training Given Me by the Revolution in Literature and Art - by Yang Ch'un-hsia (p. 72) 80

"In Nature Winds and Clouds Are Predictable" - by Ch'iu Hsiang-ch'ün (p. 76) 85

Reproduced:

Reversing Correct Verdicts Goes Against the Will of the People - Jen-min Jih-pao editorial (p. 85) 96

* * *

Unless otherwise indicated, these materials are full translations of articles appearing in People's Republic of China periodicals.

Quotations from Chairman Mao

Reversing verdicts goes against the will of the people.

With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the cooperative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticizing bourgeois rights they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeois is. It is right in the Communist Party--those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road.

All acts of regression inevitably produce the very opposite of what the protagonists have intended. There is no exception to this rule in ancient and modern times, in China and elsewhere.

What! "Take the three directives as the key link!" Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it.

This person does not grasp class struggle; he has never referred to this key link. Still his theme of "white cat, black cat," making no distinction between imperialism and Marxism.

Why did Lenin speak of exercising dictatorship over the bourgeoisie? It is essential to make this question clear. Lack of clarity on this question will lead to revisionism. This should be made known to the whole nation.

Our country at present practices a commodity system, the wage system is unequal, too, as in the eight-grade wage scale, and so forth. These can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat. So if people like Lin Piao come to power, it will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system. Therefore, we should read more Marxist-Leninist works.

The question of "for whom?" is fundamental; it is a question of principle.

We must work for the interests of the vast majority of the people, for the interests of the vast majority of the people of China and of the world, and not for the few, not for the exploiting classes, not for the bourgeoisie or the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists.

* * *

Beat Back the Right Deviationist Wind to Reverse Verdicts on Health Front

by

Miao Yü (苗 雨)

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

As everyone knows, that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party has shown extreme antipathy to "Ch'un Miao", a fine film that reflects the great proletarian cultural revolution on the health front. He walked out sulkily after seeing only half of the film and condemned it repeatedly as being "ultra-left." This incident exposes not only his opposition to the revolution in literature and art but also his hostility toward revolution in health work. It is precisely this capitalist roader who has poked his nose into the health departments and launched unbridled attacks against the new socialist things on the health front after he dished up the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link" and vigorously stirred up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts. He obstructed and interfered with the consistent implementation of Chairman Mao's brilliant "June 26" directive, and aimed the spearhead directly at Chairman Mao's proletarian line on health work.

However, reversing verdicts goes against the will of the people. The sabotage activities of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party have been boycotted by the vast numbers of cadres and the masses on the health front and aroused righteous indignation among the working people throughout the country. In the great struggle initiated and led by Chairman Mao to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, the broad masses on the health front, under the leadership of the Party committees at all levels, are criticizing the revisionist line of the unrepentant capitalist roader by grasping the question of right and wrong in order to beat back the Right deviationist wind with the magnificent achievements of the revolution in health work.

The "Ministry of Health for Urban Overlords" Must Be Criticized

The unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party negated totally and denied flatly the ironclad fact that Liu Shao-ch'i ganged up with him prior to the great proletarian cultural revolution to push the revisionist line in opposition to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. One of the methods he uses is, in conversations, to deliberately blend the achievements made under the guidance of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line with the damage done by Liu Shao-ch'i's revisionist line, and to say vaguely that the correct line has been "followed" in the "past 25 years" without making mention of either the struggle between the two lines or the great cultural revolution. In so doing, he negated the sabotage and disruption by Liu Shao-ch'i's revisionist line over the past "17 years" and negated the necessity and great significance of the great proletarian cultural revolution. With the general backstage boss picking the tune, a Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts in health circles was stirred up in no time at all to display the merits of the

revisionist line over the past "17 years." At the beginning, he muttered timidly that "it is hard to say how the past 17 years should be evaluated; more study should be made." Later, he finally came forward unmasked and said bluntly that "tremendous achievements were made" in the "past 25 years" and that "the same observation should apply to the health front." Thus, he laid bare his true color wanting to reverse verdicts and settle scores. He thus put before the proletariat a question of extreme importance: Is Chairman Mao's sharp criticism of the former health ministry as being the "ministry of health for urban overlords" correct? This question of right and wrong must be thrashed out through debate.

As a matter of fact, it is not difficult to answer this question. There is no need to "look this way" and "look that way." Only a look at the actual state of the health circles over the past "17 years" is more than sufficient. Prior to the great cultural revolution, Liu Shao-ch'i and company refused to implement Chairman Mao's proletarian line on health work. Almost all of Chairman Mao's important instructions such as "health work should be geared to the needs of workers, peasants and soldiers," "putting prevention first," "mobilizing the masses to fight against diseases by themselves" and "combining traditional Chinese medicine with Western medicine" were not implemented scrupulously. The power over medical and health work in many localities was still in the hands of bourgeois intellectuals. Under these circumstances, the emphasis in all health work was on cities to the neglect of the countryside. At that time, the bulk of manpower, material and financial resources was placed in cities. Medical and health organs were set up in cities and towns far away from the rural areas. No importance was attached to the prevention and treatment of common and frequent diseases. Seldom were medical workers sent deep into the countryside, and the question of serving the masses of peasants wholeheartedly was not seriously considered. Poor and lower-middle peasants who waded through hilly areas and crossed rivers to see a doctor or to buy medicine often were treated with discrimination and indifference or even turned away by hospitals. Let us ask those who stirred up the Right deviationist wind of reversing verdicts: Was the former ministry of health, which paid no attention to the problems of birth, old age, sickness and death of the masses of peasants, not a "ministry of health for urban overlords"? Could it be that the serious shortage of doctors and medicine in the vast countryside was "a great achievement" you "gained" in the past?

The former ministry of health emphasized cities to the neglect of the countryside. But on whom in the cities was the emphasis placed? Were they the urban working class and other laboring masses and revolutionary cadres? Definitely not. As agents of the bourgeoisie inside the Party, the revisionists represent the interests of the bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes and will never pay any attention to the working masses. Surely, among those who assumed leadership over hospitals prior to the great proletarian cultural revolution some were good, but since they followed the erroneous line pushed by Liu Shao-ch'i, the actual leadership in many localities was not in the hands of the proletariat. They never promoted ideological transformation among medical workers, and the thinking and feelings of many medical workers were alien to those of the working masses. Cases were common everywhere at that time in which sick urban working masses were treated by hospitals in a perfunctory manner and finally driven out of the hospital.

what the revisionist line on health work did care about were only a few urban overlords, particularly those capitalist roaders in the Party opposing Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. All activities, from medical system and examination and treatment methods to the orientation of medical research and objectives of medical college training, were at that time geared to the needs of the urban overlords. These conditions that existed before the great cultural revolution are still fresh in the memories of those workers, peasants and soldiers who were victims under them, as well as in the memories of the cadres and masses on the health front. If the unrepentant capitalist roaders in the Party think that once the wind of reversing verdicts is stirred up the eyes of the masses can be beclouded and those facts known to all can be blown away, they have only exaggerated their ability to make trouble.

"The question of for whom is fundamental, a question of principle." To serve the majority of the people or to serve a few is the fundamental difference between the proletarian line and the revisionist line on health work. In his article "In Memory of Norman Bethune" Chairman Mao explicitly pointed out that medical work should be geared to the needs of the masses of working people, and "utter enthusiasm should be shown toward all comrades and people" as a workstyle necessary for all revolutionary medical workers. In this article, he also criticized the erroneous attitudes toward the laboring masses. Liu Shao-ch'i and company had all along opposed Chairman Mao's revolutionary line on health work. Chairman Mao's criticizing the former ministry of health as a "ministry of health for urban overlords" meant that Liu Shao-ch'i and company pushed a revisionist line on health work. Our country has a population of 800 million, most of whom are peasants. There is a great difference in medical and health conditions between cities and the countryside, a birthmark left over from the old society. To erase this birthmark and gradually narrow and eventually eliminate this difference is an important task of the socialist revolution in health work. However, Liu Shao-ch'i and company acted against this principle, and if his way were followed, would we not return to capitalism marked by the antagonism between cities and the countryside? Lenin pointed out: A country of proletarian dictatorship during the historical period of socialism is still "a bourgeois state without the bourgeoisie." Chairman Mao's important instruction on theory maintains and develops Lenin's viewpoint. He points out that bourgeois rights inevitably remain in the historical period of socialism and "these can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat." The revisionist line on health work caters to the needs of a few urban overlords only and creates conditions for a few "to take a long rest for a small illness and to groan without sickness." Hospitals were even turned into asylums to protect capitalist roaders from mass movements. Actually, this meant enlarging bourgeois rights and reducing the socialist medical and health position to soil engendering new bourgeois elements. The present condition of the Soviet revisionists is the best teaching material by negative example. Their medical and health work caters exclusively to the privileged class. New bourgeois elements within and outside the Party monopolize the power of recuperation and medical facilities. Taking medical and health service as their unearned privileges, they keep the best rest resorts, medical supplies and medical facilities to themselves. When a working man falls sick, he has only himself to blame. As the Soviet working masses groan because of the pain of sickness, the bureaucratic-monopoly bourgeois overlords are enjoying themselves in serene rest resorts! Such opposition between classes confronting the Soviet revisionists is the very ideal that unrepentant

capitalist roader in the Party seeks even in his dreams. To gear our country's health work to the needs of consolidating the proletarian dictatorship, the proletariat, poor and lower-middle peasants as well as other working masses must unswervingly carry out Chairman Mao's revolutionary line on health work, continue to criticize the former "ministry of health for urban overlords," and repudiate that revisionist line on health work pushed by Liu Shao-ch'i and company.

Barefoot Doctors and the Cooperative Medical Service Permit No Negation

Criticizing the old ministry of health as the "ministry of health for urban overlords," Chairman Mao also emphasized: "In medical and health work, put the stress on the rural areas." Since the great proletarian cultural revolution, the broad revolutionary masses on the health front have resolutely and thoroughly implemented Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in health work and deepened criticism of the revisionist line. In this way, profound changes have taken place on the health front. In recent years we have gradually shifted the main emphasis in respect to manpower, material and financial resources in health work to the countryside. Particularly since the emergence of two new socialist things--barefoot doctors and the cooperative medical service--in the countryside, remarkable progress has been made in relieving the shortages of doctors and medicine there. Not only have the working people throughout China been elated by these developments, but people living under the capitalist system in other parts of the world, seeing the sharp contrast between the two medical systems, have warmly praised barefoot doctors and the cooperative medical service as new things that genuinely serve the people. Needless to say, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party who thinks only of the "urban overlords" is highly resentful of all these revolutionary changes. Hurriedly he jumped out to attack barefoot doctors' "low level," saying nonsensically that in future barefoot doctors must wear "straw sandals," "cloth shoes" and "leather shoes." His reactionary anxiety to reverse verdicts prompted him to attack new things to the point of using nonsensical language. Under his instigation, a cold wind to negate the cooperative medical service was instantly whipped up in society, with some describing the cooperative medical service as "socialism doing the thing of communism," as "communist wind," and so forth.

In the final analysis, how should we view the medical techniques of barefoot doctors? Medical techniques neither drop from the skies nor are innate. They are developed from medical practice and are constantly improved as a result of practice. Barefoot doctors give first priority to preventing and curing common and frequent diseases in the countryside. They apply both Chinese and Western medicine, and they also pick, grow and process medicinal herbs. They have not only a certain level of techniques but also relatively complete techniques. Some diseases declared by bourgeois specialists and authorities as "incurable" have been cured by barefoot doctors. Barefoot doctors are different from so-called doctors "graduated from universities" only in that the former have not gone to regular medical universities. But there is no natural link between high or low medical level and whether or not one has gone to university. We must not place blind faith in universities because real skills are not acquired in school, to say nothing of the fact that universities in the eyes of that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party are none other than old medical universities dominated

by the revisionist line on education. Because little attention was paid to practice at that time, graduates fresh from medical colleges usually could not work independently in preventing and curing diseases. And as what they learned was mostly geared to the needs of cities, once they went to the countryside and lost the usual medical equipment and conditions, they appeared even more helpless. The level of their medical techniques is not necessarily higher than that of those barefoot doctors who are familiar with the characteristics and causes of diseases and the physical qualities of peasants in the countryside. Of course, barefoot doctors must continue to improve their skills to serve the people through more practice and training. But when that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party attacked the barefoot doctors' "low level," he didn't mean to raise their technical level. Those blowing the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts in educational circles have done everything possible to oppose medical colleges learning the "from the commune, back to commune" experience of the Chaoyang Agricultural College in training barefoot doctors. They allow only one school to do so and categorically declare "only this one, and not the rest." This reveals that when they deride barefoot doctors' "low level," they merely attempt to create public opinion for the purpose of stifling this new thing. In this way, while barefoot doctors are not allowed to exist because of their "low level" and doctors whom they regard as having a "high level" can only serve "urban overlords," is this not an attempt to make the masses of poor and lower-middle peasants forever suffer from the shortage of doctors and medicine?

Encouraging barefoot doctors to wear shoes is a deceptive tactic used by revisionists. Barefoot doctors are noted for their "bare feet." They constitute a contingent of new-type doctors who are both peasants and doctors participating in agricultural collective productive labor and collective distribution. It is only because they are "barefoot," their feet stained with mud and medical kits slung on their backs, that they can take the poor and lower-middle peasants and other commune members to heart and serve the people wholeheartedly. As it can be imagined, if all barefoot doctors wear "leather shoes," how can they serve commune members who usually spend most of their time doing labor in the fields? When they are divorced from labor, they will also stop thinking of the masses and, as time passes, will acquire the bourgeois idea of looking down upon the working people. In plain truth, when that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party encourages barefoot doctors to wear shoes, he vainly attempts to make them depart from Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, put on revisionist shoes and take the capitalist road. As the masses of barefoot doctors say rightly, the fact that the unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party is afraid of our being barefoot proves that we have done the right thing. We will never divorce ourselves from labor and the masses. We will march forward with bare feet and forever make revolution.

That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party also maliciously attacks the barefoot doctors by saying: "Barefoot doctors cannot jump to heaven by a single step!" In his view, medical and health departments and health work must be monopolized by a small number of "insiders," and the "bare feet" of barefoot doctors are not allowed to trespass into this area. How similar this is to the fallacy of the so-called "chicken feathers can't fly up to the sky" during the movement of agricultural cooperation!

At that time, rebutting this revisionist viewpoint of Liu Shao-ch'i and company including that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, Chairman Mao said: In the era of socialism, that chicken feathers can't fly up to the sky is no longer true. "The poor want to remake their lives. The old system is dying and a new system is being born. Chicken feathers really are flying up to the sky." "It is happening in China. And it is going to happen all over the world." What an excellent rebuttal by Chairman Mao! Through the great cultural revolution, barefoot doctors and other new socialist things really are flying up to heaven! The proletariat and the poor and lower-middle peasants are taking hold of the power to control the medical service!

The rural cooperative medical service, which was born at almost the same time as barefoot doctors, reflects the urgent demand of the masses of poor and lower-middle peasants to overcome, as soon as possible, the shortage of doctors and medicine in the rural areas under the guidance of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in health work. It is a revolutionary creation of their getting organized to practice mutual assistance and cooperation and take the socialist road on the question of doctors and medicine. The funds for the cooperative medical service come partly from the accumulations of commune members on the basis of self-reliance, partly from the public welfare funds of commune members intended for establishing collective welfare facilities, and partly from funds raised by commune members. Whatever their source, all these finds are committed to the prevention and cure of diseases among commune members. The practice of raising funds from the commune members and using these funds for the commune members is essentially different from the "communist wind" of egalitarian distribution and uncompensated transfer of funds and materials. The cooperative medical service can prevent commune members from suffering hardships caused by their illnesses, and this is conducive to restricting bourgeois rights. This is where the superiority of cooperative medical service lies. Developing such a new socialist thing is precisely a job which should be done in the historical period of socialism; how can it be described as "socialism doing the thing of communism?" Yes, in the historical period of socialism, many new things with the rudimentary nature of communism will emerge, and if they must be eliminated because of this, then would not all the new things with the rudimentary nature of communism in the entire historical period of socialism lose their room to survive? In this way, socialism would never pass over to communism but can only revert to capitalism. What is meant by "socialism doing the thing of communism" is untenable both in theory and practice. Communists must ceaselessly create conditions and fight for the realization of communism. Does strangling new socialist things, fearing and even resenting communism smack of a Communist Party member a little bit?

The Principal Contradiction Must Be Clearly Recognized, The Revolution Must Be Persistently Continued

While attacking the new socialist things, unrepentant capitalist roaders within the Party also make every effort to let it be known that the main problem on the health front at present is "not learning techniques" and "not undertaking vocational research." It appears that the principal contradiction on the health front at present is not the class struggle between

the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, but is a question of whether or not to study techniques. Isn't this a naked negation of the Party's basic line and peddling the theory of the dying out of class struggle?

What is, after all, the main contradiction on the health front at present? That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party has provided a striking answer with his own words and deeds. On the one hand, he keeps babbling that the main contradiction is "not studying techniques," and, on the other, he unleashes a frantic attack on the proletariat on behalf of the bourgeoisie. The main issues he attacks, such as whether or not health work should serve the proletariat and the poor and lower-middle peasants, whether or not health work should serve the majority of the people, and whether or not the stress should be placed in the rural areas, are issues related to the orientation and road of health work. It is on these basic issues that the struggle between the two classes, two roads and two lines has raged on unabated and will not stop during the entire historical period of socialism. Obviously, if the proletariat is taken in by the rumors and sophistry of that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party and buries its head in "techniques" and "vocational work" to the extent that it lowers its guard on the above mentioned fundamental issues and fails to grasp class struggle as the key link, then health work will surely go astray. Encouraging "vocational research" and "studying techniques" is merely a smokescreen thrown up by that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party. The theory of the dying out of class struggle has always been a hypocritical revisionist theory; what it wants to "put out" is the proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie, and it itself is an ideological weapon with which the bourgeoisie benumbs and attacks the proletariat. Its concoction is intended to help the bourgeoisie in its all-out assault on the proletariat.

Chairman Mao points out: "In the historical period of socialism, there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggle. There is the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, and there is the danger of capitalist restoration." This teaching has validity for all fronts and all types of work. Though there are various contradictions on the health front, the main one remains the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. This contradiction determines and affects the existence and development of other contradictions. Technical problems can only be properly solved by putting proletarian politics in command and grasping class struggle. Why do we need vocational training? To better the health of the people or to benefit oneself? If we do not settle this issue but simply grasp techniques for their own sake, we will surely lose our bearings. Indeed, in health circles some people spread the negative view that "there is no need to read medical books or set foot in operating theaters; you can make a living by following the general trend and avoid making mistakes and getting criticized." How should such statements be viewed? They are nothing more than a reprint of the bourgeois individualist concept that "professional skills are private property." Those with deep-seated bourgeois individualist concepts regard stethoscopes, scalpels and diagnoses not as tools to serve the people, but as commodities to use for barter and as a means to bargain with the Party and the people for fame and gain. In the course of the great cultural revolution and the movement to study the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, we criticized the idea of bourgeois rights and the concept that "professional skills are

private property." Those who found such criticism not to their liking then made the statements as mentioned above. In reality, this is still a reflection of class struggle. We must firmly grasp class struggle as the key link, continue to criticize bourgeois individualist concepts, and encourage medical personnel to take the road of integrating with workers and peasants, remold their world outlook, and shift their footing to the side of the proletariat. Once they develop the concept of serving the people, the problem of professional training will take care of itself.

That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party accuses the Party leadership of "ignorance in professional matters" and clamors that health departments should be led by so-called "professionals." This is one example of how he tries to push the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link" organizationally. On this point, the health departments have learned deep lessons. Chairman Mao long ago severely criticized certain leading comrades of health departments for emphasizing that health work is a kind of special technical work, for having the wrong idea that "since you know nothing about it, keep your hands off." He pointed out that the Party must exercise leadership in everything and must provide leadership over health care. The Party's leadership over health care is most basically leadership of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line. Politics is the commander, and the soul. Leaders of health departments must firmly grasp class struggle as the key link before they will have the right perspective and see clearly the direction in which the revolution will progress. That repentant capitalist roader within the Party harps on the old cliche that "a person who does not understand vocational work cannot lead it, and outsiders cannot lead insiders," the very view used by bourgeois rightists in the formers years when they attacked the Party. This means that those so-called insiders who are "keen" on restoration and unrepentant capitalist roaders should be allowed to usurp the leadership and resurrect the "ministry of health for urban overlords" to serve their restoration of capitalism. The wheels of history cannot be turned back. Through the great proletarian cultural revolution, the masses of revolutionary people have greatly raised their consciousness of class and line struggles. That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party is extremely isolated, and he will not succeed in his conspiracy of restoration. However, the present shocking struggle between restoration and anti-restoration has once more profoundly educated us: "The issue of who will win in the revolution can only be settled over a long historical period. If things are not properly handled, it is possible for a capitalist restoration to take place at any time. Let no one in the Party or among the people in our country think that everything will be all right after one or two great cultural revolutions, or three or four. We must be very much on the alert and never lose vigilance." We must conscientiously study Chairman Mao's directives on class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat and study his series of directives on striking back at the Right deviationist wind of reversing verdicts. In accordance with Chairman Mao's great strategic plans, we must criticize the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link," and resolutely beat back the Right deviationist wind of reversing verdicts. We must take class struggle as the key link, persist in grasping revolution and promoting production, other work and preparedness against war, do a good job of all work on the health front, and carry the revolution in health through to the end!

* * *

A General Program for Capitalist Restoration*

- An analysis of "On the General Program for All Work of the Whole Party and the Whole Nation"

by

Ch'eng Yüeh (程越)

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

The great struggle against the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts is pressing ahead from victory to victory. The revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link" set forth by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party has come under penetrating criticism by Chairman Mao and by the whole Party, the whole army and the people of the whole country. Chairman Mao pointed out: "What! 'Take the three directives as the key link'! Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it." This instruction by Chairman Mao fundamentally and explicitly points out the reactionary essence of "taking the three directives as the key" in negating class struggle as the key link and the Party's basic line, in opposing the dictatorship of the proletariat and in restoring capitalism.

A small number of people once held that "taking the three directives as the key link" only involved the question of "formulation." Well, then, let us take a look at an article written under the instigation of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party. The article, entitled "On the General Program for All Work on the Whole Party and the Whole Nation" (hereunder the "General Program" for short). In even blunter words, it thoroughly exposes the program of "taking the three directives as the key link" dished up by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party as a program for all-round capitalist restoration.

I.

The "General Program" begins with setting forth realization of the "four modernizations" as the objective of struggle for the Party in the next 25 years, and then proposes "taking the three directives as the key link." The article says: "The three directives" "are not only the general program for all work of the whole Party, the whole army and the whole nation at present, but also the general work program in the entire course of struggle for fulfilling the grand goal during the next 25 years." This generalization pointedly shows that the program of "taking the three directives as the key link" dished up by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party is entirely aimed at countering Chairman Mao's instructions on taking class struggle as the key link and at negating the basic program and basic line of our Party.

What is the basic task for the whole Party and the people of the whole country in the entire historical period of socialism, including the coming 25 years? Our Party's Constitution in its "First Chapter--General Principles" clearly provides: "The basic program of the Communist Party of China is the complete overthrow of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in place of the

---

* Excerpts of this article were carried by NCNA on April 10, naming Teng Hsiao-p'ing as "that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party." - SPRCM Ed.

dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the triumph of socialism over capitalism. The ultimate aim of the Party is the realization of communism." To fulfill this basic program of our Party, Chairman Mao has set forth the Party's basic line for the entire historical period of socialism, that is: "Socialist society covers a fairly long historical period. In the historical period of socialism, there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggle, there is the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, and there is the danger of capitalist restoration. We must recognize the protracted and complex nature of this struggle. We must heighten our vigilance. We must conduct socialist education. We must correctly understand and handle class contradictions and class struggle, distinguish the contradictions between ourselves and the enemy from those among the people and handle them correctly. Otherwise a socialist country like ours will turn into its opposite and degenerate, and a capitalist restoration will take place. From now on we must remind ourselves of this every year, every month and every day so that we can retain a rather sober understanding of this problem and have a Marxist-Leninist line." Therefore, the basic task for the whole Party and the people of the whole country not only at present but also throughout the entire historical period of socialism, including the next 25 years, is to fight for nothing but the realization of our Party's basic program and the execution of its basic line.
Should we develop the national economy? Should we achieve all-round modernization of agriculture, industry, national defense, and science and technology in two stages before the end of this century? Of course we should! However, this is only a task we should fulfill in order to realize the basic program of our Party. Although it is a magnificent task, it is not the basic task of the Party, still less the whole task of our Party. Originally the "four modernizations" were set forth as a plan in connection with the task of developing the national economy. However, to pull off a monumental hoax, the "General Program" sets forth the realization of "four modernizations" as a major premise for all work both at present and in the next 25 years, a premise on which all of our work must be based. This fully shows that, in the eyes of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party, at present, in the next 25 years and throughout the entire historical period of socialism, the only task is to undertake production and construction, there being no need for class struggle, proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. This then completely negates our Party's basic program and thoroughly tampers with the basic task and the orientation of advance for the whole Party and the people of the whole country.

After setting forth the major premise, a premise which requires no attention to be paid to class struggle and socialist revolution, the "General Program" then goes on the offensive, alleging that "taking the three directives as the key link" is the "general program for all work" not only at present but also in the future, including the next 25 years. Thus, it absurdly regards Chairman Mao's important instructions on such questions as the theory of proletarian dictatorship as something serving only the purpose of achieving the "four modernizations." This is an out-and-out distortion of Chairman Mao's instructions. Those who resort to eclecticism and sophistry are opposed to dialectics and pay no attention to dialectical logic, but that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and his "General Program" even make no reference to formal logic or reasoning. On the pretext that "an unified whole cannot be cut apart," he arbitrarily proposed "taking the three directives as the key link" and in no time turned it into

a "general program for all work" of the whole Party and the whole country in the coming 25 years. Isn't that imposed on others? It is precisely by using this tactic that that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party negates class struggle as the key link, rejects the Party's basic line and concocts a revisionist program which is fundamentally antithetical to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and has nothing to do with Chairman Mao's instructions.

It is not accidental that the "General Program" begins and ends with calling for realization of "four modernizations." Here a question of utmost importance is raised, namely, what historical course China should take in the future, including the next 25 years? We believe that China is now in an important period of historical development: to adhere to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, carry the socialist revolution through to the end, build a more prosperous great socialist country and gradually march toward communism, or to practice revisionism, restore the old order and take the beaten track of Soviet social-imperialism? The next several decades will certainly be a period marked by a violent struggle between the two roads and two kinds of future. For the sake of the basic interests of the Chinese people and the people of the world, we must fight for the first kind of future and against the second. The Party's basic line is the only correct line for achieving this goal, a lifeline of the proletariat and the revolutionary people. That is why Chairman Mao has time and again pointed out: "Never forget classes and class struggle" and "we must remind ourselves of" the Party's basic line "every year, every month and every day." Since that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party substitutes "taking the three directives as the key link" for the Party's basic line and negates class struggle as the key link, he naturally wants to have the second kind of future and opposes the first. As a matter of fact, his so-called realization of "four modernizations" is nothing but a blueprint for all-round restoration of capitalism. Against this revisionist line our whole Party, whole army and the people of the whole country must of course wage a tit-for-tat struggle.

II.

Does "taking the three directives as the key link" really include the study of the theory on proletarian dictatorship? It is entirely false and deceptive. People need only to take a look at how the "General Program" distorts and opposes Chairman Mao's instruction on the question of the theory of proletarian dictatorship to be able to understand the tricks played by the revisionists.

Toward the end of 1974, Chairman Mao issued an important instruction on the question of theory, pointing out: "Why did Lenin speak of exercising dictatorship over the bourgeoisie? It is essential to make this question clear. Lack of clarity on this question will lead to revisionism. This should be made known to the whole nation." Speaking of the socialist system, Chairman Mao said: "In a word, China is a socialist country. Before liberation she was more or less the same as a capitalist country. Even now she practices an eight-grade wage system, distribution to each according to his work and exchange through money, and in all this is scarcely different from the old society. What is different is that the system of ownership has been changed." Chairman Mao pointed out: "Our country at present practices

a commodity system; the wage system is unequal, too, as in the eight-grade wage scale, and so forth. These can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat. So if people like Lin Piao come to power, it will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system. Therefore, we should read more Marxist-Leninist works." The main feature of these instructions of Chairman Mao's is to emphasize the necessity and importance of restricting bourgeois rights in combating and preventing revisionism, further pointing out to us the orientation of continuing the revolution both in the superstructure and in the economic base under the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, what does the "General Program" say about the instruction on the question of theory? It completely casts aside the main theme of Chairman Mao's instruction, namely, the question of restricting bourgeois rights, and even does not say one word about it. The question of bourgeois rights being the soil and conditions engendering a new bourgeoisie, the question of revisionism as the main danger, the question of struggle between the two lines in the Party, and the question of dealing with capitalist roaders--all these disappear out of sight in the "General Program." This clearly shows that the so-called "taking the three directives as the key link" is solely aimed at twisting and abolishing Chairman Mao's instruction on the question of theory, the theory of proletarian dictatorship.

Abolishing the actual content of the theory on proletarian dictatorship reveals the bourgeois nature of capitalist roaders. Chairman Mao, hitting the nail on the head, pointed out recently: "With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the cooperative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticizing bourgeois rights they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party--those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road." This Marxist-Leninist viewpoint of Chairman Mao's profoundly points out the errors in line committed by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and the ideological origin and class root-causes of the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts stirred up by him. It is precisely because that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party is afraid that the socialist revolution may cause him to come under fire, restrict the bourgeois rights they like and affect their bourgeois stand and world outlook that he cannot wait to dish up "taking the three directives as the key links," oppose taking class struggle as the key link, distort and tamper with Chairman Mao's instruction on the question of theory, and advocate the theory of the dying out of class struggle in order to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie both inside and outside the Party. Confronted with the Marxist revolutionary edge and afraid that their class would soon die out, those who hang up the signboard of "communists" but who actually represent the interests of the bourgeoisie always try by all possible means to distort and castrate the revolutionary content of Marxism, blunt its revolutionary edge, and make it suit the needs of the bourgeoisie. Is this not what that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and his "General Program" have done?

Do things stop here? No. Those who reject taking class struggle as the key link and advocate the theory of the dying out of class struggle have always wanted to "put out" only the proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie and not the bourgeois offensives against the proletariat.

The fact that while opposing class struggle, the "General Program" fiercely attacks the proletariat shows more than anything else this characteristic of class struggle.

Our Party's basic theory and basic practice tell us: The principal contradiction throughout the historical period of socialism is the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the main danger is revisionism, the subject of revolution is the bourgeoisie, and the target is persons in power in the Party taking the capitalist road. But what does the "General Program" say about this? Hoisting the banner of opposing the ultra-"Left," it says that the main problem at present is that some "class enemies who oppose Marxism inherit the mantle from Lin Piao, always take over our revolutionary slogans and then distort and emasculate them," that they "throw the good cadres of the Party and advanced model personalities off the stage." It even alleges that "this struggle is the concentrated expression of the present struggle between the two classes, two roads and two lines."

The "General Program" here uses the term "class enemies who oppose Marxism," but deliberately covers up its class content. To whom does it allude? The capitalist roaders in the Party? No. Not only is the "General Program" as silent about the concept of capitalist roaders in the Party as Ah Q is about the scabs on his head, but it also forbids others to refer to it. Does it allude to landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements, and old and new bourgeois elements? No, either. Because the "General Program" explains clearly that these people are not included in the concept "class enemies who oppose Marxism." In fact, judging by the fact that they regard persisting in class struggle as the key link as going against "taking the three directives as the key," this "unified whole which cannot be cut apart," "class enemies" who "emasculate revolutionary slogans" are those Chinese Communists who adhere to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, Marxists who persevere in taking class struggle as the key link. Taking a bourgeois reactionary stand, they brand all revolutionary people who persist in exercising proletarian dictatorship over the bourgeoisie as "class enemies." They do so both in writing and in practice. They describe Lin Piao's ultra-Right revisionist line as ultra-"Left". In this way, they can use such phrases as "inheriting Lin Piao's mantle" to attack all revolutionary people who criticize revisionism, i.e., Right opportunism, denounce the great proletarian cultural revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, and take the revisionist line of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao as treasure. The so-called "inheriting Lin Piao's mantle"(and not a bit inheriting Liu Shao-ch'i's mantle!) and "taking over our revolutionary slogans, distorting and emasculating them"--this Hu Feng-type rhetoric can be appreciated by the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements, old and new bourgeois elements, by unrepentant capitalist roaders and people who want to reverse the verdicts of the great proletarian cultural revolution and settle scores with it. It delights them because these are the words in their hearts they want to express.

The "General Program" also attacks class struggle and the struggle between the two lines, alleging that they "throw our Party's fine cadres and advanced model personalities off the stage." This is sheer fabrication

and slander. That unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party once said: "Proper policies must be implemented for old workers and experienced cadres because once a movement starts it often hurts them." Those words said in the "General Program" are copied from here. The phrase "once a movement starts" applies to all the important line struggles waged by our Party in the past, and all these struggles are totally negated. It may be asked: Is it true that from criticizing Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Li Li-san, Chü Ch'iu-pai, Lo Chang-lung, Wang Ming and Chang Kuo-t'ao to criticizing Kao Kang, P'eng Te-hua, Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, "once movement starts," all experienced cadres and old workers were "hurt." Did they all "throw the Party's fine cadres and advanced model personalities off the stage"? Is this not a distortion of and slander against the series of political movements carried out by our Party under Chairman Mao's leadership, including the great cultural revolution? Here, the "General Program" completely lays bare its reactionary features by pointing the spearhead at Chairman Mao and his proletarian revolutionary line. We say: "Once the movement starts," it is bound to "hurt" people. But people it "often hurt" are not experienced old cadres and workers, but those "old" chieftains of the revisionist line and the erroneous line they push. If we did not wage struggle against their erroneous line, our Party would not have developed nor led the people of the whole nation to triumphantly enter the socialist revolution from the democratic revolution, and we would not have been able to continue our advance toward communism. It is precisely because "once a movement start" it will "hurt" the revisionist line that the unrepentant capitalist roaders in the Party feel sad about this and want to reverse the verdicts and re-write our Party's history. However, this can only be sheer wishful thinking!

That unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party frantically tries to reverse the verdicts of the great proletarian cultural revolution and settle scores with it, and to carry out restorationist activities in all spheres by his "taking the three directives as the key link." He repeatedly clamors for "readjustment." How to "readjust"? The "General Program" says clearly: It is necessary to "readjust work in all fields" by "taking the three directives as the key link." "Readjustment is needed in industry, agriculture, communications and transport, finance and trade, science and technology, culture, education and health, literature and art, the army and also the Party." My goodness, nine major "readjustments"! From the economic base to the superstructure, from within the Party to outside it, from the localities to the center, everything is bad and must be "readjusted," and not a bit or drop should be allowed to escape from the net. We also say that certain work in certain fields should be readjusted, but that is aimed at further implementing Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, principles and policies, and at doing our work better. What, then, is the all-inclusive "readjustment" which that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party wants to carry out? Through the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts in such fields as education, science and technology, literature and art, and health, we have seen very clearly that he wants to use "readjustment" to reverse the verdicts of the cultural revolution and settle accounts with it and to go back to the revisionist line of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao. In calling for an all-round "readjustment," he actually wants to launch an all-out counter-attack in revenge, that is, to restore capitalism in an all-round way.

If, as the "General Program" says, some people "practice revisionism by hoisting the banner of anti-revisionism and carry out restoration by hoisting the banner of anti-restoration," that is no more than a self-portrait of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and of his "General Program" of "taking the three directives as the key link."

III.

On the question of relationship between politics and economics and between revolution and production, the "General Program" also grossly distorts and tampers with Chairman Mao's instructions. Making no mention of class struggle and socialist revolution in the economic sphere, it draws the development of the national economy into the orbit of the revisionist theory of productive forces.

As we all know, although the socialist transformation of the system of ownership of the means of production has been in the main completed in our country it has not been fully finished. Even in those sectors where socialist transformation has been carried out, a fierce struggle between transformation and anti-transformation and between restoration and anti-restoration is still present. In respect to relations between men and distribution, there is still the question of continuing to deepen the sociaist revolution. Therefore, while carrying out socialist construction, we must strive to solve various problems in the relations of production and do a good job of revolution in the superstructure. This means that we must grasp class struggle as the key link, grasp revolution and promote production. Because it is opposed to the correct policy of "grasping revolution and promoting production," the "General Program" goes all out to attack the great cultural revolution by saying that since it was started, "attention has been paid only to politics but not to economics, only to revolution but not to production. Anyone who mentions the need to grasp production and do a good job of economic construction would be accused of promoting 'the theory of productive forces' and practicing revisionism." Such an attack precisely exposes the reactionary stand of the "General Program" in upbolding the revisionist theory of productive forces.

Since the great proletarian cultural revolution began, the revolutionary masses have applied Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to revolutionary mass criticism of the revisionist line of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, including the criticism of the theory of productive forces peddled by them. Such mass criticism is a class struggle waged by the proletariat to smash capitalist restoration. This is what the "General Program" slanders as "attention has been paid only to politics but not to economics, only to revolution with not to production." However, many living facts show that the great proletarian cultural revolution is a strong motive force in the development of China's productive forces. Mass criticism of the revisionist line and the theory of productive forces has promoted the substantial development of socialist production and produced solid fruits. Is it right for the masses of people to label Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao and their like as "revisionists" and "promoters of the theory of productive forces?" Absolutely right! These two labels are quite appropriate and should not be removed! Lenin said it well: "The negation of revisionism is aimed at covering up one's own revisionism." The negation of the criticism of the revisionist theory of productive forces by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and by his "General Program" is aimed at inheriting the mantle of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, at continuing to push the counter-revolutionary revisionist line and theory of productive forces.

To say that we pay "attention only to politics but not to economics, only to revolution but not to production" is nothing but to confuse black and white and right and wrong. It may be asked: When the eight hundred million people, by relying on their own efforts, grow their own food and make their own clothing and establish an independent national economic system on the basis of self-reliance, and when they have smashed the economic blockades and blackmail by imperialism and social-imperialism, do they "not pay attention to economics" and "not pay attention to production"? Eating the food grown by the masses of people, wearing the clothes made by the masses of people and living in the houses built by the masses of people and yet uttering such nonsense as "paying no attention to economics and production"--this is virtually a shameless vilification against our Party and the vast masses and cadres battling at the frontline of industrial and agricultural production for a long time!

The difference between Marxism and the revisionist theory of productive forces is not on the question of whether or not it is necessary to grasp production and do a good job in economic construction. Marxism has always attached great importance to the development of productive forces, but it has also held all along that the development of productive forces cannot be separated from the reform of the relations of production and the superstructure, and that only by grasping revolution will it be possible to promote production. And the adjustment in the relations of production will pave the way for the development of productive forces. Man is the most important productive force. As long as proletarian politics is placed in command and man's enthusiasm for socialism is fully aroused under socialist conditions, production will flourish at a swift tempo. But the theory of productive forces does away with class struggle and the socialist revolution in the superstructure and the relations of production. It regards the development of production as the only decisive thing. Such is the crux of the matter. If we, as that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party advocates, devote ourselves only to production and construction without paying attention to class struggle and revolution and let revisionism prevail and capitalism be restored, then the developed economy, production and "four modernizations" will become material forces oppressing and enslaving the proletariat and the working people. Therefore, after the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin repeatedly reminded the Party and the people that "90 percent of our attention and activities are and should be centered on this basic issue--overthrow the bourgeoisie, establish the proletarian political power, and eliminate all possibilities of capitalist restoration."

When that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and his "General Program" so energetically attack others for "paying no attention to economics" and "paying no attention production," is he really interested in socialist production? No! His only interest is in capitalist production, in undermining the socialist relations of production and the productive forces. In his eyes, "do a good job in production" is actually intended to restore what belongs to capitalism. This is clearly disclosed in the section of the "General Program" on enterprise management. The "General Program" says: Following the development of production and technology, "rules and regulations will become increasingly strict, demanding that people strictly abide by these rules and regulations." "This is so not only in capitalist society but in socialist society as well, and will be so in the future communist society." These views totally negate the class nature of rules and regulations and ignore the

essential difference between socialism and communism, and capitalism. As we know, rules and regulations reflect human relations in production, and have a clear-cut class nature. Rules and regulations of economic sectors in capitlaist society oppress and fleece the working class and the laboring people. We are a socialist country, whose masters are the working class and laboring people. We are in favor of relying on the working class and the laboring people in setting up rules and regulations suited to the development of socialist economy. We oppose anarchy, and also object to "control, restriction and repression" of the workers and laboring people by exercising bourgeois dictatorship. The "Constitution of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company," personally approved by Chairman Mao, embodies the basic principles that should be followed by the rules and regulations of socialist enterprises. Yet the "General Program" says nothing about this but, instead, cries for the need to set up "increasingly strict" rules and regulations. The rules and regulations in the economic sectors of capitalism are indeed very strict and rigorous. The time workers spend in the toilet also has to be taken into account, and they will be punished in various ways if they exceed the time-limit allowed. But the "General Program" looks upon such rules and regulations as above-class, above-time things, claiming that this is so not only in capitalist society but also in socialist and communist societies. If this is not a call for restoring capitalism, what is it? If it is not a call for a dictatorship over the working class and the laboring people, what is it? If we link this to other words and deeds of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party, we can see even more clearly that the reason why he proposes "taking the three directives as the key link" and regards development of the national economy also a "key link" is that he wants to implement his revisionist line of "disregarding the distinction between the white cat and the black cat" and disregarding the difference between imperialism and Marxism, a line which actually wants capitalism and not socialism.

IV.

"Taking the three directives as the key link" is couched in Marxist phrases and concocted by an eclectical sleight of hand. It is a hypocritical and reactionary revisionist program. The "General Program," as a means of publicizing "taking the three directives as the key link," also reflects this characteristics. It is a big hodgepodge which is very poor theoretically, very bad in tactics, fragmentary, confusing in logic and contradictory in ideology. But it helps us further understand and criticize the reactionary essence of "taking the three directives as the key link." On this point, it is valuable teaching material by negative example.

To criticize in depth "taking the three directives as the key link" is of tremendous significance to us in upholding Marxism, and combating revisionism, sticking to socialism and opposing capitalism. A political program can be a long thesis or a simple general outline. But, be it a long thesis or a short outline, it invariably involves the principled question of whether to practice Marxism or revisionism, including the question of whether to keep to or oppose the theoretical basis of a proletarian political party. The teachers of proletarian revolution have always attached major importance to the principled nature and purity of the proletarian political program, always adopted a clear-cut stand in uncompromising struggles against all kinds of opportunist and revisionist programs, deeply and thoroughly

criticized them politically and ideologically, and pointed out the correct direction for the revolutionary cause of the proletariat. When criticizing "The Gotha Program," Marx said: "It is my duty not to give recognition, even by diplomatic silence, to what in my opinion is a thoroughly objectionable program that demoralizes the party." The moment the opportunist Duhring emerged to oppose the Party's theoretical basis, Engels intended to criticize him, and with Marx's support, he determinedly "put everything aside to deal with this nuisance--Duhring."

On the question regarding the theoretical basis of Marxism, we must adopt a serious, militant attitude. This is because the mistaken views or slogans on the question of theoretical basis will often lead to thoroughly betraying Marxism, to the evil path of revisionism. When Khrushchev put forward the revisionist line of "peaceful transition," Chairman Mao sharply pointed out: "Is the October Revolution still good? Can it still be taken as a model for all other countries? Khrushchev's report delivered at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party said that political power could be seized through the parliamentary road. This means that other countries need not learn from the October Revolution. Once this door is open, Leninism will be basically cast away." When Liu Shao-ch'i advanced the so-called "contradiction between the four-cleans and the four-uncleans" during the socialist education movement, Chairman Mao realized that this was an attempt to reject the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as the principal contradiction and to ignore the principled question that classes, class contradictions and class struggle still exist in socialist society. He pointed out: "If we forget this basic theory and practice of our Party in the past dozen years, we will go astray." When Lin Piao dished up his revisionist theoretical program of the "theory of innate genius," Chairman Mao promptly exposed its reactionary nature. He pointed out: the question of whether "history is made by heroes or by slaves," whether man's knowledge (and ability which also falls into the category of knowledge) is innate or acquired after birth, and whether we should keep to the idealist theory of transcendentalism or the materialist theory of reflection, is a major question of right and wrong concerning two classes, two lines and two kinds of world outlook. He called on the whole Party to take the Marxist stand and draw a clear demarcation line with Lin Piao's revisionism. Today, when that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party proposes "taking the three directives as the key link," it is likewise not a simple question of formulation, but a question involving whether we can uphold our Party's basic program and basic line and whether we should consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat or restore capitalism. If we are to uphold Marxism and defend the theoretical basis of the proletarian party and prevent it from being altered or distorted, we must fight and thoroughly criticize the fallacy of "taking the three directives as the key link." We believe that through the struggle to hit back at the Right deviationist wind of reversing verdicts and the thorough criticism of "taking the three directives as the key link," our Party and the revolutionary cause of the proletariat will certainly advance still more rapidly and win still greater victories.

* * *

Criticize the Slavish Comprador Philosophy

by

Fang Hai (方 海)

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

In socialist revolution and construction, whether to persist in maintaining independence, keeping the initiative in our own hands and achieving rejuvenation through one's own efforts or to push the slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of crawling behind at a snail's pace--this is a principled difference between the Marxist and the revisionist line. It is an important aspect of the struggle between the two classes and two roads in the historical period of socialism.

Before and after last summer, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party cooked up the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link," advocated the theory of productive forces, and went all out to peddle the slavish comprador philosophy under the signboard of "everything for modernization." He openly called for pinning hope on foreign countries for the development of production and the development of science and technology, clamoring for "bringing out more things to exchange for the latest and the best foreign equipment." Moreover, he claimed that "this is most dependable" and also was "a major policy." Instantly the wind of admiring things foreign and having blind faith in foreigners was whipped up once again. The creations of the laboring masses in the country were ridiculed and the revolutionary spirit of self-reliance was taken to task and subjected to attack. It appeared that it was wrong to persist in maintaining independence, keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts, and it was justified to push the slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of crawling at a snail's pace.

As in the case of the Right deviationist wind of reversing verdicts on the educational, scientific-technological, literary and art and health fronts, the spearhead of attack by this wind is directed at the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao and Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line. The current great struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind of reversing verdicts is developing in depth, and it is necessary for us to go on criticizing the slavish comprador philosophy and to expose the reactionary nature of the slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of crawling at a snail's pace pushed by that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party.

The great leader Chairman Mao points out: "Rely mainly on our own efforts while making external assistance subsidiary, break down blind faith, go in for industry, agriculture and technical and cultural revolutions independently, do away with slavishness, bury dogmatism, learn from the good experience of other countries conscientiously and be sure to study their bad experience too, so as to draw lessons from it. This is our line." This Marxist line is built on the foundation of a firm faith in and reliance on the masses of the people, a firm faith in and fully developing the superiority of the socialist system. The wealth of society is created by the workers,

peasants and working intellectuals. On the basis of the socialist system, the Chinese people are able to display inexhaustible strength. Given the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party headed by Chairman Mao, and as long as we persist in the basic line of the Party for the entire historical period of socialism, make a success of revolution in respect to the relations of production and in the sphere of the superstructure, and give full scope to the superiority of the socialist system and the ingenuity, wisdom and creative ability of the masses of the people, we are entirely capable of building a powerful socialist country with modern agriculture, modern industry, modern national defense and modern science and technology by relying on our own strength.

On the other hand, chieftains of the opportunist line within the Party always advocate the slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of crawling at a snail's pace and push a revisionist line in total opposition to maintaining independence, keeping the initiative in our own hands and achieving rejuvenation through one's own efforts. Blind to the strength of the proletariat and the masses of the people, they basically reject the Marxist truth that history is created by the masses of the people; they obliterate the differences between socialism and capitalism and between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie; and they do not believe in the superiority of the socialist system. They prostrate themselves before the Western bourgeoisie, are willing to crawl behind others at a snail's pace, and are even in favor of national betrayal and capitulation and living on alms from foreign countries. Such was a line pushed by Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao. During the great proletarian cultural revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, the broad masses and cadres penetratingly criticized the revisionist line followed by Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, a line that embodied the slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of crawling at a snail's pace. This greatly boosted the revolutionary morale of the proletariat and considerably aroused the revolutionary spirit of the broad masses in building socialism on the basis of self-reliance. Holding their heads high and going from strength to strength, people throughout the country have scored a great deal of tremendous achievements in the cause of socialist construction. The recovery of the man-made earth satellite according to plan, the adoption of new petroleum prospecting and mining techniques, the success in the trial manufacture of the large-sized internal combustion engine, the large-capacity turbo-generators with inner water-cool rotor and stator, the million operations per second electronic computer, the electron scanning microscope, and various types of digital control machine tools--all of this indicates that we are marching forward triumphantly along the road of catching up with and surpassing the world's advanced levels. However, the struggle between the two lines has not come to an end. When that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party comes out to push the slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of crawling at a snail's pace, he inherits the mantle of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao.

The difference between us and that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party does not lie in whether or not it is necessary to have "four modernizations," but in what road to take, what line to follow, and what basis our socialist construction should rest on. Chairman Mao pointed out long ago: "On what basis should our policy rest? It should rest on our

own strength, and that means regeneration through one's own efforts." To put the basis on self-reliance is a basic principle for us to carry out revolution and construction and a reliable guarantee for overcoming every difficulty and winning the victory. During the years of revolutionary war, we relied on our own strength, on the creative power of the whole army and the people, and defeated the Japanese imperialists and the Kuomintang reactionaries. After the victory of the revolutionary war, we again, under extremely harsh material conditions, relied on our own efforts and broke the imperialist blockade and embargo, resisted the obstruction and sabotage by the social-imperialists, developed our socialist economy independently, and built a poor and backward old China into a socialist new China on the road to prosperity. However, the tasks before us are still very stupendous. What do we rely on in fulfilling these stupendous tasks? The basic need is to fully mobilize and rely on the vast revolutionary masses. And without meeting this basic condition it will be impossible to build socialism with greater, faster, better and more economical results. Therefore, this is the keynote from which we cannot depart in consciously persisting in the policy of maintaining independence, keeping the initiative in our own hands and achieving rejuvenation through one's own efforts.

We are a socialist state under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and are also a big country with a large population. We can neither rob the people of other countries of their wealth nor rely on the strength of other countries in carrying out construction. Importing what is ready-made will be humiliating, nor can we build socialism successfully by depending on others. Only when we proceed from the actual conditions of our country, rely on the creative power of the people of our country, and fully utilize and tap the material resources and potentials of our country can we, within a not too long period of time, establish an independent and complete industrial system and national economic system and make our country more able to weather storms and be invincible. According to our experience, in the course of building socialism, every province, every region and even every factory and commune must promote the spirit of self-reliance, let alone a country. But that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party sings a contrary tune, calling everywhere for efforts to be made to step up exports to "exchange for more good things from abroad." It is alleged that this can accelerate the exploitation of natural resources, quicken the technical transformation of industry, and hasten the pace of scientific research. How fantastic. Is there really such a thing in the world? The class struggle that exists internationally cannot be dictated by the will of man, and the worker masses from their prolonged struggle know this. They say: "Under no circumstances must we tie the fate of our socialist construction to the belt of others." These words sharply draw our attention to the danger of our necks being held by others or led by the nose. If we do not put our basis on self-reliance but import everything that is needed, and, for the sake of imports, even cast away the socialist principle that the development of our economy must rest largely with the domestic market, exchange exports for imports in an unprincipled manner, then the following situation is bound to be created: we import everything that we can produce without restriction, export everything that is badly needed in the country without restriction, buy what is advanced from others, produce what is backward ourselves, and even give to others the sovereign right to open up mineral resources. Then, as time passed, wouldn't we turn our country into a market where the imperialist countries dump their

goods, a raw material base, a repair and assembly workshop, and an investment center? Could we still talk about the rate of industrialization or developing the socialist economy independently and with initiative kept in our own hands? We could only be an economic appendage of imperialism. If economic independence is lost, it will be impossible to maintain political independence. The Chinese people suffered most deeply in the past. More than a century ago, didn't the chieftains of the "Westernizing Group" in the Ch'ing Dynasty, Li Hung-chang and Tseng Kuo-fan, advocate that "to make China strong, there is no better way than studying foreign weapons. To study foreign weapons, there is no better way than seeking the tools for producing them"? This group of slavish compradores and traitors always wanted to buy foreign "tools for making weapons" in order to make "one strong by one's effort." What about the result? Not only did China fail to make itself strong, but it sank deeper and deeper into the chasm of a colony or semi-colony. The Kuomintang reactionaries ruled the old China for more than two decades and for more than two decades had been shouting about "construction." When they talked about so-called "construction," didn't they fix their eyes on foreign capitalists and exchange their national resources and sovereignty for foreign equipment? What did they accomplish over more than 20 years by such exchanges? The state sovereignty and the economic lifeline all fell into the hands of the imperialists, and aren't the memories of an economically bankrupt old China still fresh in our minds?

In socialist construction, only when we put the basis on self-reliance and fully develop the creative power of the masses of the people can we truly win high speed. This has been confirmed by numerous facts over the past 20 years and more and especially since the great cultural revolution. Our petroleum industry has grown at the average annual rate of over 20 percent over the last 15 years, thanks to self-reliance, and its fast speed even our enemies cannot deny. Our shipbuilding industry has also developed at a rapid rate since the great proletarian cultural revolution. Prior to the great cultural revolution, Liu Shao-ch'i said "building ships is no better than buying ships, and buying ships is no better than chartering ships," and called for the importation of machines and ships, his eyes fixed on some technical patents of foreign countries. As a result, home-made freighters and marine diesel engines were for a long time not developed. The situation was changed only when the vast worker masses and cadres criticized the revisionist line embodying the slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of crawling at a snail's pace during the great cultural revolution. In 1970, the workers in Shanghai began their battle to develop the shipbuilding industry, and in the six years up to 1975, the tonnage of ships built and the horse power of diesel engines made exceeded the sum total of those produced in the 17 years before the great cultural revolution. Only one 10,000-ton ship was built before the great cultural revolution, but in these six years, 44 ships of the 10,000-ton class or even bigger sizes were built. Do we develop faster through self-reliance or by practicing the slavish comprador philosophy? Isn't the answer very clear? But that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, while talking about developing the national economy, closes his eyes to these facts. Indeed, prejudice is farther away from truth than ignorance?

In building socialism, we must first of all adhere to a correct orientation and road. Whatever we do, we must consider whether it conforms

to the Party's basic line, whether it follows the socialist path and whether it is beneficial to the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, hoisting the banner of developing the national economy, advocates wherever he goes that provided we get the advanced technology and equipment, it doesn't matter what road we take and what methods we use. Chairman Mao pointed out recently: "This person does not grasp class struggle; he has never referred to this key link. Still his theme of 'white cat, black cat,' making no distinction between imperialism and Marxism." If we take the package offered by that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, we are bound to lead our economy onto the capitalist road. Once he spoke of the "reasons" for the importation of technology and equipment and said: "When a foreign product is dismantled and dissected, we will see that there is a lot of things inside that belong to other countries." By foreign countries are meant capitalist countries. Can it be that our country can also take the same path of economic development as the capitalist countries? When we dissect a foreign product, we find that there is indeed a lot of things that belong to other countries. The phenomenon of such economic interdependence is determined by the capitalist system and the world capitalist economic system. Precisely because of this, once an economic crisis occurs in one country, like a plague it quickly spreads to the entire capitalist world. As a matter of fact, even a capitalist country cannot truly develop its own independent economy by entirely depending on others. Those countries which depend on others in developing their economies may for a time develop their economies relatively fast, but that kind of prosperity is false and the foundation is extremely weak. Once a storm blows, they will be beset with this and that crisis and practically cannot master their own destinies. As a socialist country, we must have our own independent economic system and can only take our own road of industrial development. Without maintaining independence, keeping initiative in our own hands and achieving rejuvenation by one's own efforts, not only will it be impossible to accomplish socialist modernization, but we may even cause our socialist country to degenerate, restore capitalism and live on alms from foreign countries. Soviet revisionism is a mirror. After the general restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists bought patents and obtained loans from the Western monopoly capitalists and even did not hesitate to mortgage their undeveloped natural resources. A country which claims to be a superpower with a strong industrial foundation has incurred an increasingly heavy burden of debts. From 1964 to the first half of 1975, it begged and obtained from the Western countries loans amounting to as much as US$16.3 billion. While plundering others, it has also begged from others. Such is a big characteristic of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique's phoney communism.

When we promote rejuvenation by one's own efforts, we do not refuse to study and research the experience of foreign countries, including both the good experience and the bad. Nor are we opposed to importing certain foreign technology and equipment which are really useful. However, in dealing with foreign experience,technology and equipment, we must make a concrete analysis of them, to evaluate them, "get rid of their dross and absorb their essence," so that they may be used by us. Study must be combined with independent creation, and we must be determined to surpass others. Under no circumstances must we swallow everything raw, mechanically apply and import everything regardless of whether it is good or bad, whether it is successful or unsuccessful, and whether it suits the needs of our country or not. Chairman Mao has always called on us to break superstitions, set our thinking free, bury

dogmatism, get rid of slavishness, and criticize and repudiate the slavish comprador philosophy that "the moon in foreign countries is rounder than that in China." This is because these things are spiritual fetters stifling the innovative and creative spirit of the masses of the people and binding their hands and feet. If foreign dogmas and foreign idols are not swept away, it will be impossible to generate the dymanic revolutionary spirit.

To regard all technology and equipment of the capitalist countries as advanced is a kind of metaphysical viewpoint. Some of this technology and equipment is advanced, and some is backward, and even advanced things also have backward elements. On no account should we describe them as absolutely good without subjecting them to an analysis. Furthermore, due to the decadence of the capitalist system, the tendency toward technical stagnation has already appeared in certain sectors. In absorbing foreign things in a formalistic way, China had suffered considerably in the past. Those who blindly worship things foreign look down upon the wisdom and strength of the masses of the people in their own countries; they are shorter by a head when standing before "foreigners," and they think that they do worse than others in everything, worse even than certain bourgeois thinkers. Yen Fu, a scholar of the Ch'ing dynasty, highly relished the saying that "those who copy from others are put at a disadvantage, and those who come up with ingenious ideas thrive"; he was not in favor of mechanical application of others' methods and he was well aware of the truth that those who lagged behind might catch up and overtake. We cannot take the old road of other countries in the world in technical development and crawl behind others at a snail's pace. We must have the soaring ambition of the proletariat, we must dare to take the road that had not been taken by our predecessors, and we must dare to scale new heights that had not been scaled by our predecessors. We must have what other countries have; we also must have what other countries do not have. Since the beginning of the great cultural revolution, many factories have successfully trial produced new products and new materials, and many of these are created by the worker masses through hard work and by the use of indigenous methods. The workers say proudly: What the Western bourgeoisie can do, the proletariat of the East can certainly do and do better; and what the Western bourgeoisie cannot do, we of the proletariat of the East also can do. But that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party looks upon the things of the bourgeoisie at home and abroad as things of God, and has always looked down upon the creations of the masses of the people in our country and permits them only to crawl behind others at a snail's pace now and forever. Such a slavish comprador philosophy goes against the will of the people, and naturally it is boycotted and criticized by the masses of the people. They /sic/ are extremely dissatisfied with such boycott and criticism. However, truth is not on their side. It will be impossible for the "bigwigs" of the bourgeoisie to strangle the creative spirit of the masses of the people and suppress the masses of the people.

The slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of crawling behind others at a snail's pace have their profound class and ideological root-causes. The revisionist line is also the bourgeois line. China's comprador bourgeoisie has all along been the appendage of imperialism and has always worshipped the slavish comprador philosophy. By its very nature the national bourgeoisie is feeble; it is not only afraid of the masses of people

but also of the imperialists. It has conflicts with the imperialists and may for a period of time form with the masses of people a united front to oppose the imperialists; but, on the other hand, it depends on the imperialist economy, often yields to imperialist pressure, and worships things foreign and has blind faith in foreigners. The capitalist roaders in power within the Party are the bourgeoisie within the Party. At the stage of the democratic revolution, they joined the Party with such bad traits of the bourgeoisie. After the period of the socialist revolution set in, they have not changed their stand and still represent the bourgeoisie. Their bad traits of being afraid of the masses and of imperialism have grown stronger, and they cannot but place themselves in a position sharply antagonistic to the vast masses of the people. Class capitulation and national capitulation are twin brothers. To practice class capitulation at home will inevitably lead to national capitulation abroad and to the advocacy of the slavish comprador philosophy.

The slavish comprador philosophy is a spiritual product of imperialism's prolonged aggression against our country. As long as classes and class struggle still exist, and as long as imperialism still exists, the ghost of the slavish comprador philosophy will always hover in the minds of some people. Therefore, the criticism of the slavish comprador philosophy is a long-term task of struggle and must be carried on repeatedly. We must follow Chairman Mao's instructions, take class struggle as the key link, penetratingly criticize the slavish comprador philosophy, criticize revisionism, even more consciously persist in the policy of maintaining independence, keeping the initiative in our own hands and achieving rejuvenation through one's own efforts, accelerate the tempo of our country's socialist construction, and carry through to the end the continuous revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

* * *

The Revisionist Organizational Line Must Be Criticized

by

Pai Shan (柏 杉)

(Hung-ch'i / Red Flag /, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, while advocating "taking the three directives as the key link" and pushing a revisionist political line in opposition to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, has pushed an organizational line that goes with his political line. In the struggle to hit back at the Right deviationist wind of reversing verdicts, it is also necessary to criticize this organizational line.

His revisionist political line takes as its content, and is characterized by, the negation of the great proletarian cultural revolution and revolutionary new things emerging from the cultural revolution, restoration and regression and counter-attack in revenge. The organizational line which serves this political line is aimed at overthrowing the decisions of the great proletarian cultural revolution by a counter-attack in revenge so that those unrepentant capitalist roaders who were criticized during the great proletarian cultural revolution and who resent this revolution may again assume leadership, restore that kind of situation in which the bourgeoisie exercised dictatorship over the proletariat in certain sectors and units prior to the cultural revolution, and create the conditions for all-round restoration of capitalism.

Chairman Mao says: "To lead the revolution to victory, a political party must rely on the correctness of its own political line and organizational solidarity." ("On Contradiction") The great proletarian cultural revolution crushed the two bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, liquidated their revisionist political line as well as their organizational line which served this political line, and recaptured that part of power which was usurped by Liu Shao-ch'i's gang of renegades, secret agents and unrepentant capitalist roaders and by Lin Piao's gang of diehards. In the leading organs of the Party and state at various levels, three-in-one leading groups of the old, the middle-aged and the young were set up in accordance with the five requirements set forth by Chairman Mao for successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat. This is a tremendous achievement of the great proletarian cultural revolution, an important indication of our booming cause of proletarian revolution. Such three-in-one leading groups of the young, the middle-aged and the young have already played and are playing a vital role in implementing the Party's basic line, combating and preventing revisionism, uniting with 95 percent of the cadres and masses, consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, preventing the restoration of capitalism, and building socialism. Practice confirms that this new thing of socialism possesses strong vitality. Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist organizational line and various policies are absolutely correct.

That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party both fears and hates the fact that we are persisting in a Marxist-Leninist organizational line. He is deeply aware that a line "must be carried out by men." The question of who holds power and what kind of leading group there is is most crucial to the question of what kind of line is executed. To push the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link" and change the Party's basic line, he must reverse the decisions of the great proletarian cultural revolution on the question of organizational line. That is why he does his utmost to play up the question of leading groups. Almost at all meetings he talks about the leading group, and when talking about the leading group he discusses "adjustment." Completely ignoring the question of political orientation - to practice Marxism or revisionism, he speaks at length of the so-called "soft" group, "lazy" group, and "disorganized" group, in an effort to create public opinion in favor of his "adjusting" leading groups. Through "adjusting" leading groups, he vainly attempts to get rid of this new things of socialism - the three-in-one combination of the old, the middle-aged and the young - that emerges from the great proletarian cultural revolution and to bring back the revisionist organizational line of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao on which conclusions were already drawn at the Party's 9th and 10th Congresses. His purpose in "adjusting" leading groups is actually to change the groups and seize power.

Out of the need of pushing the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link," he has also proposed new criteria for the selection and promotion of cadres, namely, "having a strong Party spirit and a good style of work and capable of uniting with other people." This is a blatant attempt to oppose the five criteria set by Chairman Mao for successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat. In his "criteria," the most basic and most important criterion - to practice Marxism and not revisionism - disappears out of sight. When this criterion is abandoned, does the "Party spirit" to which he refers mean the Party spirit of the proletariat? Obviously not. The Party spirit is a concentrated expression of the class spirit. The first criterion of the five criteria set by Chairman Mao for successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat is to practice Marxism and not revisionism. This is the proletariat's basic criterion for the selection and promotion of cadres, and it is also the basic embodiment of the proletarian Party spirit. When "taking the three directives as the key link" is used to reject class struggle as the key link, when the Party's basic line is changed and when revisionism replaces Marxism, is there any proletarian Party spirit to speak of? Therefore, his so-called "Party spirit" can only be bourgeois Party spirit or revisionist Party spirit. He regards "putting 'daring' to the fore" as the basic point of departure for the selection and promotion of cadres. In his own words, this means "not be afraid" and "dare to touch the backside of the tiger," and "this is the primary requirement." This is the best connotation of his so-called "strong Party spirit." Once he shouted himself hoarse: "Let's find some people who are not afraid of being struck down" to set up "leading groups which are powerful, put 'daring' to the fore, and have strong work ability." Without the requirement to practice Marxism and not revisionism, what does his so-called "daring" mean? This means, in the words of some people, daring to write letters making false charges, daring to make speeches containing false accusations, daring to reverse verdicts to change the key link, daring to create political rumors, and daring to direct the spearhead at the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao

and Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line. In a word, daring to follow him in practicing revisionism. This is completely opposite to the proletarian spirit of daring to make revolution and struggle. He represents and surrenders to the bourgeoisie; not only does he not dare to stress the proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie, but he also dares not touch a single hair of the bourgeoisie and its intellectuals. It can be seen that his "strong Party spirit" means frantic opposition to Marxism and obstinate practice of revisionism. The so-called "strong spirit" is "restorationist mania"!

The important forces on whom that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party depends in pushing his revisionist line, overthrowing the the decisions of the great proletarian cultural revolution, plotting restoration and regression and launching counter-attack in revenge are those bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats. He hoists the banner of showing concern for and paying serious attention to old cadres. He says: "The leading groups must rely on the old." Who are these "old cadres" he speaks of? Are they the old comrades who adhere to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line and persist in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat? No. These old comrades, who have gone through prolonged tempering in revolutionary struggle and who have done useful work for the Party and the people, are the important component part of this brand-new thing - three-in-one combination of the old, the middle-aged and the young. They are playing an important role in the leading groups at various levels. To these old comrades he shows no concern, nor does he rely on them; instead, he spreads rumors against them, malignantly attacks them and tries by all possible means to force them out. Long before the great proletarian cultural revolution, he once cried aloud: "The old are no good." Now, when he repeatedly stresses "it is necessary to rely on the old," this is merely a hoax. The "old cadres" on whom he wants to rely are actually the "old" capitalist roaders, a small number of people who are dissatisfied with the great proletarian cultural revolution and want to settle scores with it and who oppose the socialist revolution and resent the criticism and and restriction of bourgeois rights. Does one not clearly see what kind of organizational line this is and its reactionary nature?

Employing for important jobs those bourgeois intellectuals who have not been transformed properly is also a vital aspect of the organizational line pushed by that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party. Such ideological and cultural fields as education, scientific research, literature and art, and health are important centers in which the bourgeoisie and the proletariat engage in a trial of strength. It was here the great proletarian cultural revolution was first initiated, and the proletarian dictatorship was strengthened in the sphere of the superstructure, thereby breaking the monopoly of certain departments by bourgeois intellectuals. It should be seen that through the great proletarian cultural revolution, many revolutionary intellectuals have achieved substantial progress, and they have made their due contributions to the people at their different posts in the scientific, educational, cultural, health and other fields. Some of them have taken up leadership duties at various levels. However, some bourgeois intellectuals who have not properly transformed themselves do not admit defeat, and that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party attempts to take advantage of this to get rid of this socialist new thing - occupation of the superstructure

by the working class, and to allow those bourgeois intellectuals who have not transformed themselves properly to assume the power of leadership once more. He says: "If we are technically and vocationally inefficient, we should let others work." Here, what he means by "others" does not refer to revolutionary intellectuals. What he actually means is that he openly wants to substitute domination of bourgeois intellectuals for the Party's leadership and the leadership of the working class, and to restore that kind of situation prior to the great proletarian cultural revolution, that is, "specialists run institutes" and "professors run universities." By trying to do so, he wants not only to take control of these positions, but, through these bourgeois "hereditary domains," to raise revisionist successors, in the same manner as the Soviet revisionists have done and are doing. The basic forces of the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie under Soviet revisionism consist of so-called "Red specialists" brought up in these spheres. If we follow that capitalist roader, what happens in the Soviet Union today will happen in China tomorrow. This calls for vigilance.

While gathering together restorationist forces, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party resorts to all possible means to reject and attack revolutionary cadres who adhere to Marxism, particularly those revolutionary young cadres who emerged during the great proletarian cultural revolution. Lenin once stated: "We are a party of the future, and the future belongs to young people. We are a party of reformers, and young people always like to follow reformers. We are a party that carries out a selfless struggle against old, decadent things, and young people always first plunge into the selfless struggle." ("The Crisis of Menshevism") The strong point of revolutionary young cadres is that they are sensitive to new things and have a high degree of political enthusiasm and revolutionary activism. During the great proletarian cultural revolution, they rebelled against the capitalist roaders in respose to Chairman Mao's great call. Today, they are positively criticizing and taking the lead to restrict bourgeois rights. They resolutely resist restoration and regression and the counter-attack in revenge, and take the road of integrating themselves with the workers and peasants. Therefore, in the eyes of that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, revolutionary young cadres pose a big obstacle to his pushing a revisionist line, and he will not be happy until he puts them to death. On the question of young cadres, he spreads a lot of strange notions, among which a principal one is that "they are basically inexperienced" and "have been promoted too fast." Of course, young comrades also face the problem of exerting themselves to study Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, seriously transforming their world outlook and continuing to accumulate experience in struggle. However, what does he mean by experience? Not the rich historical experience of the Chinese revolution scientifically summed up by Chairman Mao with the Marxist stand, viewpoint and method and not the practical experience of the vast masses of laboring people, but the experience which he gained in following Liu Shao-ch'i in practicing revisionism including such experience as "it doesn't matter whether it is a white cat or black cat, it is a good cat when it catches mice." These are things that had long ago been criticized by the revolutionary people. He says that young cadres have no experience, and he wants to send them "all to the basic level to temper and transform themselves," in other words, to strike down those revolutionary young comrades who refuse to accept his experience in practicing revisionism. He has also cried aloud that in the future cadres "must be promoted step by step," and "like climbing a ladder, they must climb

step by step and must not jump over it." Is this so-called "ladder" not the embodiment of the feudal conception of rank order and ideas of bourgeois rights on the question of organization? Is this not a reprint of Liu Shao-ch'i's "arranging the order of cadres on the basis of seniority"? Is this not a means habitually used by all reactionary, declining ruling classes to safeguard their rule? According to his "ladder" theory, all such principles as cultivating revolutionary new forces and three-in-one combination of the old, the middle-aged and the young would be written off. The result would be that the cause of proletarian revolution opened up by the older generation of revolutionaries would be cut short, and raising millions of successors to the cause of proletarian revolution would become an empty word.

The organizational line pushed by that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party is based theoretically on the theory of the dying out of class struggle and the theory of productive forces, with the aim of gathering together "people who reverse verdicts" to negate the great proletarian cultural revolution" and of organizing "home-returning corps" for capitalist restoration so as to allow the bourgeoisie within the Party to rise to power. This organizational line has its profound class origin. In the historical period of socialism, due to the existence of classes, class contradictions and class struggle, the commodity system is still practiced, exchange through money is still effected, bourgeois rights still exist, and the old soil inevitably produces new poisonous weeds. Such poisonous weeds may grow within the ruling Communist Party. Those bourgeois and petty bourgeois democrats who came over to the proletarian revolutionary ranks gained very high positions, obtained very great power, and enjoyed very good treatment with the victory of the democratic revolution. Not only have they ceased to make revolution, they have also opposed others making revolution. From the first they belonged to the bourgeoisie and represent the interests of the new and old bourgeoisie. That unrepentant capitalist roader is precisely the chief representative of the bourgeoisie both inside and outside the Party. He obstinately sticks to bourgeois rights and the concept of bourgeois rights. To him, the private ownership of knowledge must not be criticized, the power of the bigwigs of the bourgeoisie must not be encroached upon, the rank order must not be disturbed a bit, and the small people oppressed by the bourgeoisie must not be allowed to rise up in revolution. Judging from his organizational line, we can likewise perceive the class essence of that unrepentant capitalist roader in representing the bourgeoisie.

The organizational line pushed by that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party is in no way different from that pushed by Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao. Liu Shao-ch'i attacked the many to protect a handful. Lin Piao dismissed a group of people from their posts and promoted a group of people to higher posts. That unrepentant capitalist roader dismisses a large number of people from their posts, transfers a large number of people to other posts, and changes a large number of posts. They have all practiced revisionism, opposed Marxism, organized restorationist forces, and attacked the revolutionary forces with the ultimate aim of restoring capitalism. Essentially they are all on the Right. They have also inherited the mantle from Confucius. Confucius called for "ruthless" suppression of reformers, and after three months in office he had Shao Cheng Mao executed. That capitalist roader wants to "put 'strict' to the fore" in dealing with revolutionaries. Once he went

back to work, he began to strike at the revolutionaries. Confucius "called to office people who fell into obscurity" and "appointed the worthy" in order to gather together restorationist forces. That capitalist roader supports capitalist roaders who are still on the capitalist road and intellectuals who have not properly transformed themselves in order to rig up "home-returning corps." Following the footsprints of Confucius, he launches a full-scale counter-attack in revenge against the proletariat politically, ideologically and organizationally.

Lenin said: "What is restoration? Restoration means that state power falls into the hands of the political representatives of the old system." ("The Agrarian Program of the Social-democratic Party in the First Revolution of Russia") Only a short time has passed since that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party has gone back to work, but he has mounted a very fierce counter-attack in revenge politically and organizationally. In a few places where the Right deviationist wind of reversing verdicts has blown most severely, the capitalist roaders throw up their hats and congratulate each other, while the revolutionaries come under fire. In those places where they have changed the people in Party and government posts and seized power, "taking the three directives as the key link" is shouted the loudest and the chariot is turned to the other direction the fastest in favor of restoring capitalism. These shocking facts amply show the frenzy and reactionary nature of the restorationist forces. It is not difficult to imagine that if he were allowed to go on doing what he wants, "then inevitably a nationwide counter-revolutionary restoration would take place, the Marxist-Leninist party would turn into a revisionist and fascist party, and the whole of China would change color."

This restorationist farce staged by that man who had followed Liu Shao-ch'i in practicing revisionism, who was criticized during the great proletarian cultural revolution and who has swore "never to reverse the verdict" has further opened up our eyes, enabling us to see more clearly the protracted nature of the class and line struggles and the danger of the possible restoration of capitalism. We must, led by the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, take class struggle as the key link and carry through to the end the great struggle to hit back at the Right deviationist wind of reversing verdicts!

* * *

No One Is Allowed To Obliterate the Difference Between Socialism and Capitalism

- Refuting the "white cat, black cat" theory

by

Chin Chih-pai (靳志柏)

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

In the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, our great leader Chairman Mao has penetratingly exposed and criticized the revisionist essence of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party in negating taking class struggle as the key link. He pointed out: "This person does not grasp class struggle; he has never referred to this key link. Still his theme of 'white cat, black cat,' making no distinction between imperialism and Marxism." Conscientiously studying this important instruction of Chairman Mao's, deeply criticizing the reactionary theory of "white cat, black cat," and distinguishing between Marxism and revisionism and between socialism and capitalism,and imperialism is of immense significance to our effort to adhere to the Party's basic line and carry socialist revolution to its completion.

The reactionary fallacy that "no matter whether a cat is white or black, it is a good cat as long as it catches mice" was dished out in 1961. Due to the sabotage of the Khrushchev renegade clique of the Soviet Union and serious natural disasters at the time, our country encountered temporary economic difficulties, with the struggle between the two classes, the two roads and the two lines becoming very acute and violent. Clapping their hands and applauding the temporary economic difficulties confronting us, the class enemies at home and abroad reviled our country's economy as on the "brink of collapse" and held that socialist China would perish. Echoing the class enemies at home and abroad, the ringleaders of the revisionist line within our Party did everything possible to distort the causes of the appearance of temporary difficulties and attributed them to the socialist system and the Party's line, principles and policies, without mentioning a word about Soviet sabotage and the serious extent of natural disasters. They wrongly assessed the situation and, thinking that the moment for restoring capitalism had come, launched frantic attacks on socialism. The renegade, hidden traitor and scab Liu Shao-ch'i clamored at the top of his voice: "Industry and agriculture should retreat sufficiently to include the fixing of output quotas based on the household and farming on an individual basis." The bourgeois careerist and conspirator Lin Piao also did his best to restore the capitalist relations of production, declaring that among the different relations of production in the world "we should use the one that can boost production." In these circumstances, that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party also sprang out and said: "Where is the superiority of socialism? Its superiority was apparent several years ago but not these years; we can no longer be boastful." He then prated about the theme "no matter whether a cat is black or white, it is a good cat as long it catches mice." To be more precise, he put it this way: "In determining which form of production relations is good, I am afraid we have to take this attitude, that is, adopt the form that will contribute in a better way to the recovery and

development of production in each particular locality." "As long as production can be increased, going it alone will also do." Clearly, he considered the capitalist system better than the socialist system when the latter did not work or "catches no mice." He tried his best to revert the collective economy to the individual economy, that is, "dragging" the new China on the socialist road back to the capitalist path.

Which after all is better, socialism or capitalism? Whither is China heading for? This question has been made clear. Chairman Mao explicitly pointed out long ago: "The present social system of our country is far superior to that of the old days. If it were not so, the old system would not have been overthrown and the new system could not have been established. In saying that socialist relations of production are better suited to the development of the productive forces than are the old relations of production, we mean that they permit the productive forces to develop at a speed unattainable in the old society." ("On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People") Although at that time our country encountered temporary economic difficulties, they were difficulties in the course of advance and could be overcome by relying on the Party's leadership and the enthusiasm of the masses of the people, and by relying on the socialist system itself. Guided by Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, the whole Party and the people of the whole country persist in taking class struggle as the key link, criticize revisionism and capitalism, adhere to the principle of maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts and strengthen and consolidate the socialist system under the dictatorship of the proletariat. After further implementing the Party's rural policies, strengthening the three-level ownership of the collective economy with the team as the basis and further mobilizing the socialist activism of the broad masses, the national economy was rapidly rehabilitated and the situation quickly took a turn for the better. Agricultural production in our country has since brought in good harvests for 14 years running while industrial production has also advanced in big strides. Hasn't this shining historical fact fully attested to the incomparably superior strength of the socialist system as compared to the capitalist system? Hasn't this given a forceful rebuttal and repudiation to the theory of "white cat, black cat" that negates socialism and advocates capitalism? Iron-clad facts eloquently show that "only socialism can save China." If we allow the capitalist theory of "white cat, black cat" to make its appearance as that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party suggested, and if we go it alone, engage in speculation and profiteering and promote free trading, then the socialist collective economy will crumble, the socialist cause will go to ruin and the state of proletarian dictatorship will become a state of bourgeois dictatorship. The restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union will then appear in our country. This is absolutely not permitted by the whole Party and the people of the whole country. We can only advance, not turn back. We can only take the socialist and not the capitalist road.

During the great proletarian cultural revolution the theory of "white cat, black cat" was soberly taken to task by the vast numbers of revolutionary people. While that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party verbally admitted his "wrong" thesis and expressed his readiness to "correct" it, did he really do so? No, he didn't. He returned to his old self after he went back to work, doing everything possible to peddle the "white cat, black cat" trash and persisting in taking the capitalist road. The revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link" dished

out by him is a continuation and development of the "white cat, black cat" theory for he has thrown overboard class struggle as the key link. He denies the objective fact that in socialist society there are classes and class struggle, and instead preaches the theory of the dying out of class struggle. What he actually has in mind is to "extinguish" the proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie and incite the bourgeoisie to attack the proletariat. He dwells on the promotion of stability and unity and on the need to push up the national economy as a guise for splitting the revolutionary ranks and undermining industrial and agricultural production.

Furthermore, that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party also has spread a host of similar absurdities in other spheres, vainly trying to substitute the revisionist line for Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line in various domains. He says without reservations, "'White and expert' are good for the People's Republic of China" and "we should cherish and commend them." Through his provocations, fallacies such as "regardless of whether it is a black or red line, it is a good line if it produces useful people and things" came to the fore. Whether red and expert, or white and expert, this is a question of taking the socialist or the capitalist road. Only by persistently taking the socialist road and integrating themselves with the worker-peasant masses to become both red and expert can intellectuals contribute to socialist revolution and construction. Despite their "proficiency," those intellectuals stubbornly taking the capitalist road are detrimental instead of beneficial to our socialist state of proletarian dictatorship. As Chairman Mao has pointed out, "They do not like our state, i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat, and yearn for the old society. Whenever there is an opportunity, they will stir up trouble and attempt to overthrow the Communist Party and restore the old China. As between the proletarian and bourgeois roads, as between the socialist and the capitalist roads, these people stubbornly choose to follow the latter." ("Speech at CCP National Conference on Propaganda Work") Aren't facts exactly so? In 1957 some Rightist elements in cultural, educational, scientific and technological circles fell into the anti-Party and anti-socialist quagmire after taking the white and expert road. These people served as the social basis and tools for persons like Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao in restoring capitalism. If they were of any use, they served the purpose of restoring capitalism and subverting the dictatorship of the proletariat. Having been tempered in the great proletarian cultural revolution, most intellectuals in our country have made varying degrees of progress. They are willing to serve socialism and ready to integrate with the worker-peasant masses. However, they are still imbued with a host of old ideas of the bourgeoisie and it is necessary that they continue to transform their world outlook. In 1957, Chairman Mao expressed the earnest hope that "Chinese intellectuals will continue to make progress and, in the course of study and work, gradually acquire the communist world outlook, get a better grasp of Marxism-Leninism and become integrated with the workers and peasants. We hope they will not stop halfway, or, what is worse, slip back, for there will be no future for them in going backward." ("On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People") When more and more intellectuals are complying with Chairman Mao's teachings and advancing toward the goal of becoming both red and expert, that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party preaches the "benefits" of becoming white and expert. In reality, he is opposed to the Party's effort to carry out ideological remolding of bourgeois intellectuals, in a vain attempt to drag the vast numbers of intellectuals who are willing to make progress to

the old revisionist path that prevailed before the great cultural revolution to serve as his tools for restoring capitalism. How sinister his motive is!

Prating about the word "daring," that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party is keen on putting "daring to the fore." He seldom discusses things like serving which class, taking what road or carrying out what line, but holds that daring to act is good. This is no different from his "white cat, black cat" thesis. In class society there is no such thing as "daring" in the abstract and above classes since it is something concrete. What we advocate is the dauntless revolutionary spirit of the proletariat, such as "we can clasp the moon in the ninth heaven and seize turtles deep down in the five seas." On the journey of fighting for communism, we should not be afraid of any powerful enemy nor any hardships and difficulties. We should have the daring to struggle, to win victories, to go against the tide, to smash all of the old order and establish a new world. When he tries so hard to advocate putting "daring to the fore" and "doing things with purpose and drive," what after all is he after? He seeks to incite a handful of unrepentant capitalist roaders to engage the proletariat in a "desperate" trial of strength and dare to practice revisionism and restore capitalism. Since taking the socialist road is in keeping with the will of the people, those who take the capitalist road are extremely isolated. Consequently, some people who want to reverse verdicts are afraid of doing so and some who aspire to restoration dare not do anything about it. That unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party is deeply aware of the state of mind of these people, so he does his best to advocate putting "daring to the fore" for the purpose of boosting their morale and inciting them to stir up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, reverse the decisions of the great cultural revolution and settle account with the great cultural revolution. Putting it bluntly, such "daring" is essentially similar to the "spirit of Hai Jui" preached by P'eng Te-huai and the "spirit of Edajima" trumpeted by Lin Piao, the only difference being that in the abstract sense the word "daring" is more elusive and therefore more deceptive.

Although that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party is not referring to philosophy in prating about the theory of "white cat, black cat," it is related to the important question of the theory of cognition, that is the objective criterion of truth. The view that "a good cat catches mice" is nothing but a copy of that notorious bourgeois pragmatist philosophy. Pragmatism preaches "what is useful is the truth" to advertise a philosophy that transcends classes. In reality it is downright subjective idealism. It categorically rejects the objective nature of truth and rejects the practice of hundreds of millions of the masses as the only criterion for verifying truth, using instead usefulness to "me," that is, the bourgeoisie, as a basis for measuring right and wrong. According to this reactionary view of "truth," rumor-mongering and resorting to sophistry is useful to practicing conspiracies and intrigues, brutally exploiting the laboring people is useful to the bourgeoisie, and the theory of the dying out of class struggle and the theory of productive forces are of benefit to restoring capitalism--and all these embody truth. Apparently, such a philosophy which defends the bourgeoisie and the capitalist system is utterly absurd and reactionary. Since pragmatism safeguards the interests of the bourgeoisie and is deceptive to a certain extent, it meets the needs of the revisionists in promoting restoration and regression. They often pick up this tattered weapon from the ideological amory of the bourgeoisie to attack the proletariat. Under the guise of "boosting production," that unrepentant capitalist roader in the

Party preaches going it alone and negates the socialist road. He cites "useful" as a pretext to favor white and expert and negate red and expert. Under the pretext that "it can solve problems," he encourages the bourgeoisie to display the "brave" spirit of attacking the proletariat and opposes the undaunted revolutionary spirit of the proletariat in overthrowing the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes. And so on and so forth. Isn't all this the pragmatist stuff of the bourgeoisie? In order to oppose socialism, he has gone so far as to invoke pragmatism in total disregard of the objective criterion of truth, the objective laws of social development, and the Marxist method of class analysis. This shows the extent of his degeneration!

Since socialism is diametrically opposed to capitalism, between them there always exists irreconcilable struggle. The result of this struggle can only be development for one and destruction for the other, with one "devouring" the other. Therefore, all revisionists try to do away with this struggle. As Chairman Mao pointed out: "The revisionists deny the differences between socialism and capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What they advocate is in fact not the socialist line but the capitalist line." ("Speech at CCP National Conference on Propaganda Work") From advocating the theory of "white cat, black cat" to dishing out "taking the three directives as the key link," what that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party has consistently pushed is a capitalist line, that is, the revisionist line. This line seeks to deny that the proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie is the principal contradiction in socialist society. It denies that the main danger in socialist society is revisionism. It reverses the decisions of the great cultural revolution and settles account with it so as to transform the socialist system into the capitalist system, the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

We must attach importance to teaching material by negative example. Both new and old revisionists invariably resort to tricks that transcend classes or in the abstract to blur the distinctions between socialism and capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, in this way substituting the revisionist line for the Marxist-Leninist line. In order to oppose the transformation of the new democratic revolution into socialist revolution, Liu Shao-ch'i did everything possible to advocate the capitalist system, declaring that "capitalist exploitation is not a crime but a merit" and that "the more persons are exploited, more benefits will accrue to the people." He said so in a vain attempt to undermine the cause of socialist revolution. This teaches us by negative example that it is extremely important to draw a line of distinction on the question of class and line struggles. In the current great struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, we must conscientiously study works by Marx and Lenin and by Chairman Mao, raise our consciousness of class and line struggles, further identify the nature, purpose, tasks and future of socialist revolution, distinguish between correct and incorrect lines politically and ideologically, penetratingly criticize the revisionist line pushed by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party, and carry the continued revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat through to the end.

* * *

Actively Participate in Struggle To Hit Back at the Right Deviationist Wind to Reverse Verdicts

by

the Party Branch of the "Good Eighth Company on Nanking Road"

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

Since early December last year, under the leadership of the higher-level Party committee, our company has taken an active part in the great struggle, initiated and led personally by Chairman Mao, to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts. In recent months, cadres and fighters of the whole company have conscientiously studied the series of Chairman Mao's important instructions and the Marxist theories regarding the dictatorship of the proletariat. By using such means as blackboard bulletins, mass criticism poster columns, mass criticism meetings and poetry contests, they extoll the great victories of the great cultural revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, praise new socialist things, repudiate the weird talk featuring the verdict-reversing Right deviationist wind, and criticize that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party who proposes "taking the three directives as the key link." Every squad puts up its mass criticism poster column and everyone joins in writing mass criticism articles. More than 680 critical articles have been written up to the present. Studying and criticism enable everyone to receive an extremely profound education in class and line struggles, giving powerful impetus to the building of the company and all its work.

Looking back at the practice of struggle in recent months, we have deeply realized that in order to take an active part in the struggle, we must first of all raise our understanding of the nature, tasks and significance of this struggle. As the struggle develops in depth and through the study of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, we see more clearly that that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party stirred up the Right deviationist wind for the purpose of turning the chariot of history around in the direction of restoration and regression. If his conspiracy were allowed to succeed, the Party would turn revisionist, the country would degenerate, and the laboring people would have to suffer for a second time. To hit back at the Right deviationist wind and criticize the revisionist line is a great event before the whole Party, the whole army and the people of the whole country. The Chinese People's Liberation Army, built and commanded personally by Chairman Mao, "is an armed body for carrying out the political tasks of the revolution." In the socialist period, the People's Liberation Army is a mighty pillar for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. To oppose external aggression and subversion and internal restoration and regression is our army's basic task. Under the leadership of the Party, to join hands with the people of the whole country in resolutely repelling the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts is a glorious duty of our army. The comrades say rightly: Since that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party wants restoration and regression, we workers, peasants, and soldiers must fight against such an attempt; since he wants to reverse the

decisions of the great cultural revolution, we must oppose his effort and protect and develop the fruits of the great proletarian cultural revolution.

To take an active part in the struggle to hit back at the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts is also imperative to strengthening the building of the company. During the great proletarian cultural revolution, the masses of cadres and fighters of our army, in response to Chairman Mao's great call, took an active part in "the three supports" /support the Left, support industry and support agriculture/ and "the two militaries" /military training and military control/ and, together with the masses of the people, criticized revisionism and the bourgeoisie, and won new merit in the struggle to smash the two bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao. In the course of struggle, we were enormously steeled and profoundly educated, such that the relationship between the army and the people became still closer, the unity between officers and men was further cemented, and the military and political qualities of the army were greatly improved. By talking to their hearts' content about the gains of the great cultural revolution, the cadres and fighters have realized even more that the current struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind provides the best classroom for the army units to conduct an education on the Party's basic line and to study the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and also provides a golden opportunity to be tempered in the violent storms of class struggle.

During the revolutionary mass criticism, we have directed full attention to grasping the orientation of struggle and aimed the spearhead of criticism at that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party who introduces "taking the three directives as the key link" and at that revisionist line he pushes. Chairman Mao points out: "You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party--those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road." The current struggle is provoked by the bourgeoisie within the Party, those in power taking the capitalist road. The Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, which was stirred up around last summer and was so violent, owed its root and origin to that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and his revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link." The fighters say: There is a core to the many absurdities of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party, and there is a program for the extensive spread of poison. This is "taking the three directives as the key link." All other strange notions are derived from this sinister program. In order to push this revisionist program and bring about all-round restoration of capitalism, that unrepentant capitalist roader vigorously advocates such revisionist absurdities as the theory of the dying out of class struggle, the theory of productive forces, the theory that weapons decide everything, and the purely military viewpoint in order to negate the taking of class struggle as the key link and oppose the proletariat exercising dictatorship over the bourgeoisie. He frenziedly attacks the proletariat on behalf of the bourgeoisie and willfully spreads the fallacy that "the present is not as good as the past," smearing beyond recognition the exceedingly favorable situation developed since the great cultural revolution and describing the People's Liberation Army steeled during the great cultural revolution as good for nothing. He opposes the three-in-one combination of the old, the middle-aged and young in an attempt to strangle the new forces that emerged from the great proletarian cultural revolution

and creates public opinion to have capitalist roaders reinstated. In the course of criticism, we firmly grasped "taking the three directives as the key link" and criticized one by one the absurd arguments put forward by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party in various fields. In all, we criticized more than 80 sinister remarks made by him covering eleven aspects. From various facets we analyzed the reactionary essence of "taking the three directives as the key link" and exposed the evil purpose of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party in bringing about all-round restoration of capitalism. As everyone says, such criticism not only hits the nail on the head, but also gives a profound education.

Chairman Mao says: "We need Marxism in our struggle." In taking part in the struggle to repel the Right deviationist wind, it is necessary to give the study of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought first priority. As the fighters say, study is the foundation of criticism, and the more the struggle develops in depth, the greater the need to study. In the course of criticism, we were not merely satisfied with every comrade expressing his stand, but also required him to profoundly and thoroughly criticize the revisionist fallacies by combining theory with practice, such that truths were elaborated with thoroughness and criticism was provided with a theoretical basis. When the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link" was criticized, we made arrangements for everyone to conscientiously study Chairman Mao's theses on classes, class contradictions and class struggle in the socialist period. It was clear that "taking the three directives as the key link" was revisionist in that it opposed taking class struggle as the key link, and that its theoretical basis was the theory of the dying out of class struggle and the theory of productive forces. We also organized everyone to study Lenin's "More on the Trade Union, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin" and repeatedly appreciate this teaching of his: "'This and that,' 'on the one hand, and on the other'--such is Bukharin's theoretical stand. Such is eclecticism." From Bukharin's base acts to oppose Marxism by putting politics on a par with economics, we see clearly that that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party proposes "taking the three directives as the key link" not for the purpose of truly implementing these three directives, but in order to resort to eclectic tactics to smuggle in that kind of revisionist stuff of "regardless of whether it is a white cat or a black cat, it is a good cat when it catches mice." After repeated study and criticism in this manner, we all saw more clearly and criticized more thoroughly the reactionary essence of "taking the three directives as the key link."

Thanks to study and criticism, both the cadres and fighters of the company have further deepened their understanding of taking class struggle as the key link. Chairman Mao says: "What! 'Take the three directives as the key link!' Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it." Taking Chairman Mao's instruction as our weapon in criticizing "taking the three directives as the key link," we have perceived that only class struggle can be the key link of all work. The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is the principal contradiction in the period of socialism. This contradiction exists universally, not only in society but also in the Communist Party. It regulates and decides all other contradictions on various fronts and in various fields. Therefore, no matter what kind of work we do--education, science and technology, literature and art, health,

economic affairs and the building of the army, we must persevere in the proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie before we can hold the key link and keep to the socialist orientation. As the comrades say, the army, being the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat, has all the more reason to persist in taking class struggle as the key link, and under no circumstances should this key link--class struggle--be replaced by another. The reason why, after its entry into the city, our company was able to beat back the attack of the bourgeois sugar-coated bullets and remained immune to contamination in a bustling city was that we conscientiously studied Chairman Mao's report at the 2nd Plenary Session of the Party's 7th Central Committee nor relaxed our grip on the key link, class struggle. Both the cadres and fighters expressed unanimously their determination to continue taking class struggle as the key link, keep criticizing the bourgeoisie and revisionism, and, in accordance with Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, do a good job of building up our army unit and indeed of all our work.

While taking part in the struggle to repel the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, we have persisted in education by positive example. Both study and criticism activities of the company are conducted in an organized and orderly way and under the unified leadership of the higher-level Party committee and the Party branch. The Party branch requires its members to take the lead in studying and criticizing and directs its attention to developing the role of the theoretical contingent, so that both the company cadres and the theoretical backbone elements may become a shock force in study and criticism. In recent months, in accordance with Chairman Mao's principle of "grasp revolution, promote production, other work and preparedness against war," we have grasped the key link to let everything fall into place and made overall arrangements for all work. This has brought about a new phase to the company's building and all its work. The consciousness of the cadres and fighters in class struggle, line struggle and in continued revolution has been raised, while the study of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought has become even more extensive and deep-going. The communist spirit has been promoted, and learning from Lei Feng in both word and deed has become a general practice. The actual actions of the comrades tell that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party that the spirit of Lei Feng will be handed down from generation to generation and millions and millions of Lei Fengs are growing up. Old fighters of the company who are to retire this year resoundingly submit: "We keep class struggle in our minds, and we will never give up combatting and preventing revisionism." They resolutely request that they be sent to the countryside, to the frontier areas where they can devote the rest of their lives to hard struggles to restrict bourgeois rights and narrow the three major differences. The struggle to repel the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts has promoted the further realization of work in war preparedness, such that, since military training started this year, it has produced excellent results. We are determined to make an even greater effort to study Chairman Mao's important instructions, conscientiously sum up experience, and continue to raise our ability to fight the bourgeoisie and revisionism.

* * *

Communists Must Work for the Interests of the Vast Majority of People*

by

Yüeh Hai (岳 海)

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

Working for the interests of the vast majority of people of China and the world is the purpose of our Party as well as the code of conduct for every communist who is really devoted to the cause of communism.

Speaking of the requirements for successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat, Chairman Mao regards the question of whether one should work for the interests of the many or a few as an important hallmark distinguishing Marxists from revisionists. He teaches us: "We must work for the interests of the vast majority of the people, for the interests of the vast majority of the people of China and of the world, and not for the few, not for the exploiting classes, not for the bourgeoisie or the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and rightists." Whether one should work for the interests of the vast majority or a few is essentially a question of what class stand one takes. We communists must firmly take the proletarian stand, always persist in working for the interests of the vast majority, never halt on the revolutionary journey, and forever carry on the revolution along the Marxist-Leninist line.

In the present great struggle against the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, we should re-study Chairman Mao's teaching that communists must work for the interests of the vast majority of the people, find out whom the capitalist roaders in power within the Party are working for, and thoroughly expose the class essence of those who represent the bourgeoisie. From this, we can draw many useful lessons, both positive and negative.

What are the greatest interests of the workers, poor and lower-middle peasants and other working people--the vast majority--in the historical period of socialism? They lie in perseveringly continuing, under the leadership of the CCP--vanguard of the proletariat, the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat until all classes and class distinctions are abolished and communism is ultimately realized. On the eve of the founding of the PRC, Chairman Mao pointed out to the whole Party that the victory of the democratic revolution was only "the first step in a long march of 10,000 li," and that the road ahead would be longer, and the work greater and more arduous. After the establishment of the socialist system, Chairman Mao again taught us that we should use the law of the unity of opposites to observe socialist society. We should note that in the period of socialism, there are classes, class contradictions and class struggle, there is the danger of capitalist restoration, and there is still the need to continue the revolution. It is precisely on this question that that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party has betrayed the basic interests of the proletariat and of the broad masses of working people. To protect the interests of the bourgeoisie, he has done his utmost to consolidate and expand bourgeois rights and to push a revisionist line in a vain attempt to restore capitalism and turn the wheel of history backward.

---

* Excerpts of this article were carried by NCNA on April 13, naming Teng Hsiao-p'ing as "that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party."--SPRCM Ed.

In his important instruction on the question of theory, Chairman Mao pointed out: "In a word, China is a socialist country. Before liberation it was more or less the same as a capitalist country. Even now it practices an eight-grade wage system, distribution according to work and exchange through money,and in all this is scarcely different from the old society. What is different is that the system of ownership has been changed." He also pointed out: "Our country at present practices a commodity system, and the wage system is unequal too, as in the eight-grade wage scale, and so forth. These can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus, if people like Lin Piao come to power, it will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system. Therefore, we should read some more Marxist-Leninist works." The country we have built is still a bourgeois country without capitalists, and there are still bourgeois rights. This is an important economic basis for engendering new bourgeois elements. In this sense the present society is scarcely different from the old. Only by waging a protracted struggle and persistently restricting bourgeois rights under the dictatorship of the proletariat will we be able to gradually create conditions in which it is impossible for the bourgeoisie to exist or for a new bourgeoisie to arise. Only thus will we be able to realize the great goal of communism. Always taking a critical attitude toward bourgeois rights, Marxists hold that, although these rights are inevitable in the historical period of socialism, they are "defects" which must be restricted and gradually eliminated. However, revisionists regard these rights as something sacred and inviolable and go all out to consolidate and expand them. Why? Because the existence of bourgeois rights constitutes the soil and condition for engendering capitalism and the bourgeoisie, provides the revisionists with a place to cultivate themselves and a tool to practice restoration and regression. For bourgeois rights, equality in form covers up inequality in fact, and to expand these rights is to expand inequality in fact. By taking advantage of the commodity system and the principle of exchange by means of money and by using legal or illegal means, those who are anxious to take the capitalist road misappropriate state and collective property. By using bourgeois rights in distribution and in relations among men, they energetically resort to material incentives and widen class distinctions. New bourgeois elements arise precisely from this soil, which is "scarcely different from that in the old society."

Not only are bourgeois rights the soil for engendering the bourgeoisie in society, but, more important, they are also the soil enabling some persons in the Party who want to protect and expand the interests of bourgeois rights to gradually turn into the bourgeoisie in the Party. The persons in power within the Party taking the capitalist road are new poisonous weeds which have grown on this old soil. After the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin pointed out: "As for those who look at the victory over the capitalists in the way the petty proprietors look at it--'they grabbed, let me have a go too'--indeed, every one of them is the source of a new generation of bourgeois." The capitalist roaders are precisely such "a new generation of bourgeois." When they become high-ranking officials, draw high salaries and lead a comfortable life, they forget about revolution. Not only do they try their utmost to preserve their vested interests, but they also do their utmost to grab some more. Thus they are bound to protect the interests of the new and old bourgeoisie including themselves, and carry out activities with a view to restoring capitalism. Once they push a revisionist line and

"lead the proletariat in catering to the self-interest of bourgeois groups or factions," they will betray the proletariat and their class position will change in the bourgeois direction. The experience of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party who was a "fellow-traveler" during the period of the democratic revolution and who has become a bourgeois representative in the Party in the period of socialist revolution fully illustrates this point. Originally, he joined the Communist Party with serious ideas of bourgeois rights, seeking high office and rich emoluments, joining the partnership to receive handsome dividends, and taking the revolutionary cause as a ladder for his personal advancement. When the democratic revolution was victorious and he received considerable political and material benefits, his ultimate goal was also achieved. When the socialist revolution gradually deepens and bourgeois rights are increasingly restricted, he exerts himself to safeguard them as an apologist and champion of bourgeois rights. He energetically attacks the great proletarian cultural revolution and the new socialist things that have struck out at bourgeois rights, and vainly attempts to settle accounts with the cultural revolution and reverse the verdicts on it. He uses bourgeois rights to recruit a gang of capitalist roaders and rig up a "home-going contingent" in order to restore capitalism. He uses bourgeois rights in the relations among men to sow discord between new and old cadres and to strike at the new revolutionary forces. He uses bourgeois rights as bait to lead intellectuals onto the white and expert road of "three-famous and three-high." And so forth. In this way, he fills the role as a representative of bourgeois interests in the Party and fundamentally betrays the revolutionary interests of the proletariat.

Since the capitalist roaders represent the interests of the bourgeoisie in the Party and are the bourgeoisie in the Party, they inevitably come into sharp conflicts with the vast masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, revolutionary cadres and revolutionary intellectuals. Such contradictions are a concentrated manifestation of the struggle between the two classes, two roads and two lines in the period of socialism as well as a reflection within the Party of class contradictions in society. The vast masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, revolutionary cadres and revolutionary intellectuals want to continue the revolution, restrict bourgeois rights, build socialism and realize communism. However, the Party capitalist roaders--these revisionist overlords--want to defend and expand bourgeois rights and restore capitalism. The struggle between them is a struggle between two opposing classes, a struggle which will go on for a long time in socialist society. Since capitalist roaders want to practice revisionism, they are bound to suppress the revolutionary demands of the revolutionary people. And since the workers, peasants and soldiers, revolutionary cadres and revolutionary intellectuals do not like to be suppressed by revisionist bigshots, they cannot but make revolution against the capitalist roaders within the Party. It is precisely in these circumstances that the current struggle to beat back the Right deviationist attempt to reverse verdicts has emerged. When that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, in order to maintain the interests of the bourgeoisie, hoists the sinister banner of "taking the three directives as the key link," wields the big baton of "readjustment" and spreads a net with a view to completely destroying the fruits of victory of the great proletarian cultural revolution, shouldn't the revolutionary people resolutely rise up and struggle against them?

Chairman Mao pointed out recently: "You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party--those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road." This instruction by Chairman Mao profoundly exposes the class nature of the capitalist roaders in representing the bourgeoisie and clearly tells us that the capitalist roaders are the bourgeoisie within the Party during the period of socialist revolution. That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party who stirred up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts is also the general agent of the bourgeoisie within the Party. Lenin taught us: In analyzing all social problems, "we must firmly grasp the facts of class division and the change in the form of class rule and take these facts as the basic clue." If we use this "basic clue" put forward by Lenin to analyze the capitalist roaders within the Party, we can see clearly that they represent the interests of both the new and old bourgeoisie in a concentrated way and are representatives of the bourgeoisie within the Party. We can also find their marked class characteristics in politics, economics and ideology. Politically, why do they always take the reactionary bourgeois stand, oppose Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, oppose the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, oppose the socialist system under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and stubbornly carry out a revisionist line of restoration and regression? Economically, why do they always exert their utmost to strengthen and expand bourgeois rights, practice material incentives in a big way, put profits in command, undermine the socialist economic base and vainly attempt to turn the socialist system of ownership into a capitalist system or ownership? Ideologically, why do they always stubbornly cling to the bourgeois world outlook, maintain the old ideas, culture, customs and habits of feudalism, capitalism and revisionism, use the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius to corrupt and poison people and shape public opinion for a capitalist restoration? This can be explained only in terms of the class nature of the bourgeoisie they represent. With the socialist revolution developing continuously in depth, "a new and higher form of struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie has been brought to the order of the day." We must fully realize the harm and danger of the capitalist roaders within the Party and wage a resolute struggle against them so as to insure that Party and state leadership at all levels is firmly in the hands of genuine Marxist-Leninists and not usurped by the bourgeoisie.

After the proletariat seizes political power, the Communist Party becomes a ruling party. Whether or not our Party members, especially those who are cadres in leading posts, can correctly deal with the power and treatment given them by the Party and the people is a vital question of principle of whether or not they can continue the revolution and serve the vast majority of people. Chairman Mao says: "Who gives us power? The working class, the poor and lower-middle peasants, the laboring masses comprising over 90 percent of the population." "We communists seek no official posts, but revolution. Each of us must have a thoroughgoing revolutionary spirit. We should not be divorced from the masses even for a moment." The seizure and control of political power by the proletariat is meant to use this powerful tool of dictatorship to exercise all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in order to finally eliminate all classes and class differences and realize communism. On no account should we use the power given us by the people to serve the private interests of a few, expand bourgeois rights or add to the soil and conditions that breed new bourgeois elements. We have

many outstanding Party members and cadres who, following Chairman Mao's instructions, strive to restrict bourgeois rights. They are divorced neither from productive labor nor from the masses. They serve as officials but without bureaucratic airs. They do not hold power for personal ends. They do not seek special privileges despite their high office. They wholeheartedly serve the vast majority of the people. However, some people who take the bourgeois stand have different ideas. They regard participation in revolution as a kind of investment and think that they must reap "profits" from this investment. They regard holding power as being an official and think that an official must enjoy special privileges. They regard the material rewards given by the people as something to which they are entitled. They even seek private interests by all means, even unjustified ones, and turn their power into "capital." The higher their position and greater their power, the more greedy and vicious they become. Inevitably they become powerholders taking the capitalist road and practicing revisionism. This merits our utmost vigilance. If a cadre "tries only to 'grab' something by exploiting his status as a member of the ruling party and hesitates to shoulder the heavy burden of working selflessly for the cause of communism," he is no longer a communist. If this kind of person refuses to amend his way, he will eventually go to the side opposite to the masses and finds himself abandoned by history.

In order to work for the interests of the vast majority of people, communists must, in the final analysis, strengthen the transformation of their world outlook. Chairman Mao has attached great importance to the question of remolding one's world outlook. He emphasizes: "Not only those who have not changed their basic stand need remolding, everybody should study and remold himself." If one's world outlook is bourgeois, one will easily fall under the influence of revisionism, toe the revisionist line, take the side of the bourgeoisie, run counter to the Party's line and purpose, and may even degenerate into a revisionist. Examples such as this are not lacking in the history of the struggle between the two lines within our Party. That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party has also taught us a good lesson on this question. We must act upon Chairman Mao's teachings, conscientiously study Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in the course of revolutionary struggle, arduously remold our world outlook, and eradicate the influence of the idea of bourgeois rights. We must make a complete break with all traditional ideas and become communists who wholeheartedly work for the interests of the vast majority of the people of China and the world, and dedicate themselves to the fight for the emancipation of all mankind.

* * *

Why Are Capitalist Roaders Afraid of Criticizing Water Margin?

by

Yen Feng (燕枫)

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

In August last year, at a crucial moment when the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts was blowing wild and class struggle was extremely acute, our great leader Chairman Mao issued an important instruction on the criticism of Water Margin: "The merit of the book Water Margin lies precisely in the portrayal of capitulation. It serves as teaching material by negative example to help all people recognize capitulationists." "Water Margin is against corrupt officials only, but not against the emperor. It excludes Ch'ao Kai from the 108 people. Sung Chiang pushes capitulationism, practices revisionism, changes Ch'ao's Chü-i T'ing to Chung-i T'ang, and accepts the offer of amnesty and enlistment. Sung Chiang's struggle against Kao Ch'iu is a struggle waged by one faction against another within the landlord class. As soon as he surrenders, Sung Chiang goes to fight Fang La." Profoundly exposing the reactionary nature of Sung Chiang and all other capitulationists, past and present, in practicing revisionism and capitulationism, Chairman Mao's instruction provided us with a powerful ideological weapon not only to continue the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and combat and prevent revisionism, but also to distinguish and criticize the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts which was then blowing ferociously. Like a battle call, it inspired the proletariat and the revolutionary people to rise up courageously to lash out at revisionism and capitulationism. Like a thunderbolt, it made the bourgeoisie and its representatives shudder with extreme fear. Around the question of criticizing Water Margin was a sharp struggle at close quarters between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and between Marxism and revisionism.

In this fierce battle between the two classes and two lines, that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party went to the battleground stripped to the waist and staged an utterly ugly show. He was extremely afraid that the criticism of Water Margin would interfere with his Right deviationist activities to reverse verdicts, and therefore he resorted to every means to downgrade the great significance of this criticism, alleging that criticism of Water Margin "won't be of much use." He frantically suppressed the mass movement to criticize Water Margin and put out the fires everywhere, saying "we must not expect rain the moment we hear the wind" and "think that there's going to be another movement." He deliberately changed the orientation of the struggle to criticize Water Margin and, playing it cool time and again, said: "What are you afraid of? You aren't Sung Chiang or a capitulationist." What was more, he even viciously attacked the criticism of Water Margin as a pretext to "make an issue," to "carry out a conspiracy," thereby pointing the spearhead directly at the great leader Chairman Mao. How blatant he has become!

Here we can see clearly that the unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party appears to be very ferocious, while inwardly he is very weak. His warning against "expecting rain the moment we hear the wind" was meant

to forestall the advent of a revolutionary tempest. His all-out effort to oppose the great struggle to criticize Water Margin amounted to nothing but a struggle in despair.

Why is the unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party so afraid of criticizing Water Margin? Because he is a modern capitulationist practicing revisionism. The important instruction issued by Chairman Mao on the criticism of Water Margin and the great struggle waged by the millions upon millions of masses to carry it out, while whipping the ancient capitulationists, pained the modern capitulationists. It is only too natural that the unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party should be startled like a bird by the mere twang of a bowstring.

The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything. The most basic thing for the capitulationists, past and present, to do in practicing revisionism and capitulationism is to tamper with the correct line of the revolutionary contingent. When Sung Chiang became "chief of the Liangshan stronghold," the first thing he did was to change the name of "Chü-i T'ing" into "Chung-i T'ang" and replace Ch'ao Kai's revolutionary line with the capitulationist line of opposing corrupt officials only but not the emperor. Once the line changes, everything changes. The favorable revolutionary situation of the Liangshan peasant uprising was gone, the revolutionary armed forces of the peasantry turned into reactionary armed forces of the landlord class, a vigorous peasant uprising was exterminated, the flag fell and people perished, and the revolutionary cause was totally destroyed. The moment the unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party went back to work, he could not wait to present a revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link" behind the back of Chairman Mao and the Party Central Committee, negating the basic theory and practice of our Party in taking class struggle as the key link over the past 20 years and more. His purpose is to change the Party's basic line, subvert the dictatorship of the proletariat, and restore capitalism. It is precisely in the context of the line and the great significance of combating and preventing revisionism, consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and preventing the restoration of capitalism that Chairman Mao proposes making Water Margin "serve as teaching material by negative example to help all people recognize capitulationists." In accordance with Chairman Mao's instructions, we must unfold criticism of Water Margin and "make an issue" of combating and preventing revisionism. Doesn't the fact that the unrepentant capitalist roader is so afraid of the revolutionary people "making an issue" out of the subject of Water Margin show that he himself is a modern capitulationist practicing revisionism? As to the "conspiracy" charge, he is wrong. This is an open act. Haven't we clearly stated in black and white our opposition against revisionism and capitulationism? If he has nothing devilish in his mind, why is he so angry?

Of utmost importance to the success or defeat of revolution is the question of which class holds the power of leadership. Therefore, capitulationists, past and present, must make desperate efforts to usurp leadership in practicing revisionism and capitulationism. In criticizing Water Margin for "excluding Ch'ao Kai from the 108 people," Chairman Mao

emphasizes the importance of leadership. One vital condition for Sung Chiang to push the capitulationist line was his recruiting renegades and defectors, rigging up a following, installing his faithful associates and getting rid of his opponents, so that the leadership of the Liangshan insurgent army gradually slipped into the hands of representatives of the landlord class such as "descendants of the royal house, men of great wealth, generals and officials." By relying on these people, Sung Chiang was able to change the revolutionary nature of the Liangshan insurgent army and realize his counter-revolutionary wish to "return to the court." Like Sung Chiang the capitulationist, does the unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party also devote serious attention to grasping leadership? In the name of "readjustments," on the one hand he rejects and attacks cadres, new and old, who adhere to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, and, on the other, he gathers together and offers important positions to those capitalist roaders who were criticized by the masses during the great cultural revolution and who have so far remained bitter and want to settle accounts with it. He attempts to groom and back up these people again to rig up a revisionist hardcore to serve as the backbone force to bring about the reversal of verdicts and a capitalist restoration. In the course of criticizing Water Margin, the broad masses were able, from the lesson of Sung Chiang usurping the leadership of the Liangshan insurgent army, to further recognize the danger of revisionists attempting to usurp Party and state leadership at various levels, and understand the truth that "restoration means that state power falls into the hands of political representatives of the old system." This so frightened that unrepentant capitalist roader that he went everywhere and shouted "don't be afraid" to keep the support of his men. Is it true that he is really not afraid? Then, why take the trouble of saying so? The fact that he has said so many things to keep his "men" steady, such as "make up your mind now" and "don't be afraid of being struck down for a second time" not only exposes his sinister motive in putting together a revisionist working group to scheme for reversing verdicts and restoring capitalism, but also shows his extremely feeble nature.

In practicing revisionism and capitulationism, capitulationists, past and present, may have their own respective historical and class features, but essentially speaking, they are all representatives of moribund exploiting classes. Sung Chiang was a landlord class element who sneaked into the peasant insurgent ranks. He was well versed in the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius on loyalty, filial piety, benevolence and justice, a master of the tacts and skills of the exploiting class who ambitiously desired to accomplish great counter-revolutionary things, in hopes of "bringing honor and prosperity to his family" and himself "gaining rapid promotions". The purpose of his going up the mountain was not to make revolution but to surrender, in other words, to "pledge loyalty" to the feudal court by a devious path. Although that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party hangs up the signboard of a "Communist Party member," he actually represents the interests of the bourgeoisie within and without the Party. During the period of the democratic revolution, he joined the revolutionary ranks with the coat of arms of the exploiting class, and he has never thoroughly transformed his world outlook. He has never been a Marxist, but a bourgeois democrat. While calling himself a Communist, he actually wants to establish a bourgeois ideal kingdom. After the revolution entered the socialist stage, his thoughts remained at the stage of the democratic revolution, and he

stubbornly held on to the bourgeois stand. It is therefore inevitable that his thoughts are alien to the socialist revolution and that, opposed to the proletariat, he naturally becomes a restorationist maniac representing bourgeois interests and pulling back the chariot of history. Haven't his ugly acts in blowing the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts including opposing and undermining the criticism of Water Margin provided the clearest evidence of this?

Chairman Mao points out: "Though opportunists who want to stem the tide can be found almost everywhere, the tide cannot be stemmed." Though the unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party has resorted to all kinds of tactics to frenziedly harass and sabotage the criticism of Water Margin in an attempt to divert it from its correct path, he has not been able to stop the torrents of the revolutionary struggle to criticize Water Margin, but, contrary to his wishes, his true features of practicing revisionism and capitulationism have been even more glaringly exposed. Chairman Mao's important instruction on the criticism of Water Margin is a reflection of the strong desire of the whole Party, the whole army and the people of the whole country to continue the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Under the guidance of Chairman Mao's important instruction, the mass movement to criticize Water Margin vigorously surged forward, breaking through one obstacle after another, continuing to deepen, and playing a powerful role in the struggle against revisionism and capitulationism. Didn't the unrepentant capitalist roader say that criticism of Water Margin "won't be of much use?" But what about the facts? Through the criticism of Water Margin, the broad masses and cadres enhanced their ability to discern revisionism and capitulationism, and from ancient capitulationists they identified the reactionary essence of modern capitulationists, making themselves ideologically prepared to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts. Chairman Mao's important instruction on the criticism of Water Margin is not only the ideological weapon with which to discern revisionism and capitulationism during the current struggle to repel the Right deviationist wind, but also is of vital significance to our Party and the people of our country in adhering to Marxism, opposing revisionism and implementing Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in the future. It is entirely futile for the unrepentant capitalist roader to attempt to downgrade the vital significance of criticizing Water Margin.

Facts about class struggle, past and present, repeatedly confirm that revisionists invariably resort to capitulation. The capitalist roaders in the Party who represent the interests of the bourgeoisie are lackeys capitulating to the bourgeoisie. "The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road"--this is a social phenomenon that will exist for a long time during the entire period of socialism. As long as there are classes and class struggle, capitulationists such as Sung Chiang will appear. In the current great struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, we should continue to criticize Water Margin in connection with the study of the theory of proletarian dictatorship, so as to help all people recognize capitulationists and carry the struggle against revisionism and capitulationism through to the end.

* * *

There Is No Future in Going Backward

by

Kan Ko (甘戈)

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

The current great struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts is the continuation and deepening of the great proletarian cultural revolution; it defends and develops the fruits of victory of this revolution. In setting a revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link" and pushing a revisionist line as a counter-weight to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party intends to subvert the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore capitalism. Launching an all-out attack against our Party, the proletariat and the broad masses of revolutionary people politically, ideologically and organizationally, he vainly attempts to negate the great proletarian cultural revolution, turn back the wheel of history and lead our great socialist motherland onto the revisionist path. This is a struggle between revolution and restoration, progress and regression, a struggle bearing on the future and destiny of our Party and state and involving the basic question of whether to carry the socialist revolution through to the end and march toward communism or to give up revolution half-way and go backward to capitalism.

Marxism holds that the proletariat's "socialism is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of all class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations." The abolition of these "four all" is the historical task and actual content of the continued revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is decided by the class status of the proletariat. The proletariat can ultimately emancipate itself only by thoroughly emancipating the whole of mankind. After the victory of the democratic revolution, the workers and poor and lower-middle peasants did not halt but demanded to carry the socialist revolution through to the end. They don't like to be oppressed by such "bigwigs" as capitalist roaders. They don't like the permanent existence of bourgeois rights that engender capitalism and the bourgeoisie. They don't like all inequalities in fact. They want to march toward the great communist goal and abolish those "four all." Our great leader Chairman Mao's theory on continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat has developed the Marxist idea of uninterrupted revolution, and represents in a concentrated way the fundamental interests and aspirations of the masses of workers and peasants. Over the past 20 years and more since the founding of the People's Republic, the broad masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, revolutionary cadres and revolutionary intellectuals in our country have incessantly pushed the socialist revolution from one stage to another along the road indicated by Chairman Mao.

After the land reform was completed throughout the country, the broad masses of poor and lower-middle peasants who held their destiny in their own hands, overriding the repression and opposition of the "bigwigs"--capitalist roaders in power in the Party, set up agricultural producers cooperatives by relying on their own strength, in the "paupers'" spirit, and in line with the orientation of cooperative transformation indicated by Chairman Mao. Despite the fact that Liu Shao-ch'i and company wantonly vilified the movement of the cooperative transformation of agriculture and went all out to chop them down, the high tide of agricultural cooperativization rose higher and higher, breaking all resistance and triumphantly forging ahead. This was followed by a high tide of socialist transformation of individual handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce. By 1956, the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce was completed in the main throughout the country.

However, the socialist revolution did not end, and the masses of workers and peasants continued to press ahead. Following the great victory of the rectification movement and the anti-Rightist struggle in 1957, an unprecedented revolutionary mass movement emerged in our country. Under the guidance of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, millions upon millions of revolutionary people continued to vigorously push forward the socialist revolution in the economic, political, ideological, technological and cultural fields. The Party's general line for socialist construction enabled the masses of the people in their millions to bring into play their boundless wisdom and great strength, opening up an exciting new phase of great leap forward. The people's commune--a brand new social organization of great vitality--emerged to meet people's needs, and socialism advanced triumphantly everywhere. Although P'eng Te-huai and his handful of Right opportunists vilified the great revolutionary movement of several hundred million people as "petty bourgeoisie fanaticism," nonsensically describing the people's commune as "premature" and "a mess," this did not in the least prevent the worker and peasant masses from marching forward in gigantic steps. Under the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, the whole Party and the people of the whole nation crushed their attack and continued to heroically advance toward the great victory of socialism and the great future of communism.

The great proletarian cultural revolution initiated and led by Chairman Mao himself is a great practice of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and combating and preventing revisionism, a practice in which millions upon millions of people have participated. It has pushed the socialist revolution in our country to a new stage. In this great political revolution waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, the people in their millions have made full use of such forms as contending and blooming, big-character posters and big debate to launch an all-out attack against the bourgeoisie, directing the spearhead of struggle at the capitalist roaders in power in the Party. They smashed the two bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, criticized their revisionist line, and eradicated the filth of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes. Under Chairman Mao's great call "the working class must exercise overall leadership," the working class and its reliable ally--the poor and lower-middle peasants--triumphantly marched into various spheres of the superstructure such as culture and education. The revolution

in literature and art exemplified by revolutionary model theatrical works has ushered in the dazzling spring of socialist literature and art. The revolution in education has victoriously advanced in struggle in the direction indicated by Chairman Mao. The revolution in health has changed the rural outlook marked by shortages of doctors and medicine, the cooperative medical service has been extensively introduced, and barefoot doctors are growing up healthily. The vast numbers of cadres, taking the May 7 road, have renewed their revolutionary youthfulness. School leavers have gone to mountainous and rural areas to take the road of integrating with workers and peasants. Millions upon millions of successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat are sturdily maturing in the vast world. The development of worker-peasant-soldier theoretical contingents has given an impetus to the socialist revolution on the ideological and cultural fronts. All of this is a new achievement of the proletariat's triumph over the bourgeoisie, a creation of vitality attributed to the masses in their millions; it has restricted bourgeois rights in all respects, an indication that the broad masses of workers and peasants in our country are ceaselessly pressing ahead along the socialist road.

The history of the past 20 years and more since the founding of the People's Republic shows that under the guidance of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, our Party "has always represented the interests of the entire movement" "in various stages of development of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie." It has led the broad masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, revolutionary cadres and revolutionary intellectuals to march ahead along the road of socialist revolution. However, some people in the Party have always tried to hinder the advance of the worker and peasant masses and stubbornly insisted on going backward to capitalism. Why? Chairman Mao pointed out recently: "With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the cooperative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticizing bourgeois rights, they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party--those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road." Chairman Mao pointed out specifically that capitalist roaders in power within the Party are the bourgeoisie inside the Party during the socialist period. The bourgeois interests they represent decide that they are bound to oppose the socialist revolution and take the capitalist road. Some of them joined the revolution as bourgeois democrats, and only partially endorsed the Party's minimum program without accepting its supreme program. They did not demand the abolition of all exploiting classes and the system of exploitation or changing the whole of society; what they wanted was only to change the existing society in such a way as to satisfy and make them comfortable. To them, the victory of the democratic revolution meant the end of the revolution. When the revolution entered the socialist stage, their contradictions with the masses of workers and peasants became more and more acute. When they became big "officials," they were "only 'out for' the benefits accruing to membership of a government Party and do not want to bear the burden of self-sacrificing work on behalf of communism." They turned their duties and power in serving the people into privileges of ruling over the people, made use of their power of control over the means of production and livelihood to seek personal gains, and turned into a new bourgeoisie. To defend the interests of the bourgeoisie and the interests of their few, they opposed the revolution of the masses of workers and peasants in every way. They were as

afraid of restricting bourgeois rights and the worker and peasant masses carrying the socialist revolution through to the end as the landlords were afraid of losing their land and the capitalists their capital. As a result, they always wanted to drag the workers and peasants back. Engels pointed out: "The proletarian movement necessarily must go through various stages of development; at every stage there is always a section of people who stay behind and do not go on." If such bourgeois democrats within the Party do not remold their thinking, they are bound to stop and retreat and become capitalist roaders.

Class struggle is "the direct motive force of history." Although those bourgeois democrats orally approve of socialism when they go over to socialism, since they refuse to acknowledge the existence of class struggle in the socialist period, their pronouncement of support for the socialist revolution becomes an empty word. That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, while setting forth the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link," publicly cried aloud, "how can we talk about class struggle every day?" Faced with the reality of classes and class struggle, can the proletariat afford not to talk about class struggle every day? In fact, the capitalist roader who opposes "talking every day" about class struggle has himself wildly clamored for the need to attack the masses of the people "in 360 days a year." He has never forgotten to wage struggle against the proletariat even for a single day. The progress we talk about has class content; this means that the proletariat should triumph over the bourgeoisie, socialism over capitalism and Marxism over revisionism, all exploiting classes and systems of exploitation are gradually eliminated, and we advance toward communism. But that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party does his utmost to obliterate the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and this in fact is a general retreat toward capitalism.

Some people who fail to keep pace with the worker and peasant masses turn into opponents of socialist revolution, and this is because they are high above the latter and divorce themselves from the revolutionary struggle of the masses. Since they neither read Marxist-Leninist works nor take part in the revolutionary struggle of the masses, they cannot set up the communist world outlook. Marxism holds that historical activities are activities of the masses of people, and that "vigorous and creative socialism is built by the masses themselves." The masses of people, since they directly participate in the three great revolutionary movements of class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiments in society, are "truly familiar" with the contradictions in socialist society, the conditions of various classes in society, the relations between various classes, problems that must be resolved at every stage of the revolution, and so forth. Their socialist enthusiasm is constantly displayed during revolutionary practice. Without going deep among the masses, we cannot see their potentially inexhaustible enthusiasm for socialism, and if we do not know their determination and confidence in carrying the socialist revolution through to the end, we would not believe that they have rich wisdom and experience in carrying out socialist revolution. Consequently, we cannot understand the group after group of socialist new things created by the masses nor perceive the differences between the masses and us. Only by going deep into reality and among the masses, listening to their opinions and humbly learning from them can we keep pace with the masses. Chairman Mao points out:

Revolutionary statesmen "are simply leaders of millions upon millions of statesmen--the masses." "They are not the kind of aristocratic 'statesmen' who work behind closed doors and fancy they have a monopoly of wisdom. Herein lies the difference in principle between proletarian statesmen and decadent bourgeois statesmen." That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, because he has for a long time divorced himself from the masses and refused to listen to their opinions, is bound to oppose the millions upon millions of statesmen--the masses, and the line he pushes must be a revisionist line which runs counter to the fundamental interests of the masses of people. Like all decadent bourgeois statesmen, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party teaches people a very deep lesson by what he has done--by negative example. In order to persevere in continuing the revolution, we must truly go deep among the masses, learn from the masses and press ahead together with the masses of workers and peasants.

We Communists are vanguard fighters of the proletariat and work for the interests of the vast majority of people. Not only must we continue to press ahead rather than come to a stop after the democratic revolution, but even today, after carrying out socialist revolution for more than 20 years, we must still make revolution and forge ahead. And even a thousand or ten thousand years hence advanced elements among the masses of people must still continue to make revolution. Lenin pointed out: "In politics, as in the entire social life, we would be out-molded if we do not press ahead. Either the bourgeoisie grows strong after the democratic revolution (the democratic revolution naturally strengthens the bourgeoisie) and takes away all the fruits of victory of the masses of the people--or the proletariat and the peasant masses beat out the road of advance by themselves." This sharply tells us that after the democratic revolution, if the proletariat and the working masses do not persist in continuously pressing ahead and carry the socialist revolution through to the end, the bourgeoisie will grow strong and the revolution will sustain defeat. The transition from capitalism to communism is a historical period, during which people of the overthrown exploiting classes still exist and, irreconciled to defeat, still dream of staging a comeback. Moreover, as bourgeois rights and the influence of small production still exist, new bourgeois elements will unavoidably emerge. The capitalist roaders in power in the Party are the bourgeoisie within the Party. They hold great power and practice revisionism in the name of "Communists"; they are extremely deceitful and are far more dangerous than the old bourgeoisie. Once they succeed, capitalism will be restored, history will go backward, the people will suffer, the Party and state will change their color, the dark old society will reappear, and the millions upon millions of working people will again become slaves exploited, oppressed and humiliated. How dangerous a situation this will be! That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party pushes the revisionist line in a vain attempt to restore the old order and return to the past, and this is something which the broad masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, revolutionary cadres and revolutionary intellectuals will never tolerate. The fact that they are so isolated among the masses provides the strongest evidence of this.

The proletariat will surely triumph over the bourgeoisie and socialism over capitalism--this is the general trend of the historical development of human society, an objective law independent of man's will.

Although temporary reversals,twists and turns may appear in the long course of historical development, and although those who practice restoration and regression may have their way for some time, in the end they cannot but be crushed to pieces by the rolling wheels of history. "All acts of regression inevitably produce the very opposite of what the protagonists have intended. There is no exception to this rule in ancient and modern times, in China and elsewhere." Confucius, the forerunner of restorationists in Chinese history, vainly attempted to restore the slave system; Yüan Shih-k'ai and Chang Hsün vainly attempted to restore the feudal monarchy; Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao vainly attempted to restore capitalism. Which of them was an exception? In 1955, pointing his finger at those diehards who obstructed the socialist upsurge in the Chinese countryside, Chairman Mao pointed out: "Although there are opportunists who want to stem the tide almost everywhere, the tide cannot be stemmed. Socialism is advancing triumphantly everywhere, leaving all stumbling blocks behind." Today, in the struggle waged by the Chinese people to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, we advise those diehards and restorationists: You'd better give up your dream of restoration and regression! Because history has long ago drawn the conclusion: there is no future in going backward. We Chinese Communists and Chinese people are full of confidence in our future. No matter how the diehards and restorationists try to opposed and curse us and sabotage and disrupt our work, they cannot prevent us from resolutely and bravely pressing ahead along the road of Marxism-Leninism.

* * *

Marxism and Natural Science

by

Hsin Feng (辛 风)

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

People stirring up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts distort Chairman Mao's thesis on the relationship between Marxism and natural science by the despicable tactic of quoting out of context. On the pretext that Marxism cannot replace natural science, they vainly attempt to negate the guidance of Marxism over natural science. This is a striking manifestation of their pushing a revisionist line in the scientific-technological sectors in accordance with the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link," an open betrayal of Marxism. For this reason, we must thoroughly expose and criticize them for what they really are.

Chairman Mao says: "Marxism embraces but cannot replace realism in literary and artistic creation, just as it embraces but cannot replace the atomic and electronic theories in physics." ("Talks at the Yenan Forum on Literature and Art") This instruction of Chairman Mao's generalizes in its entirety the relationship between Marxism and natural science, clearly pointing to the significance of Marxism as the guide to natural science.

Marxism is the crystallization of all the knowledge of man, including natural science. Marxist philosophy, i.e., dialectical materialism and historical materialism, "is the generalization and summation of the knowledge of nature and the knowledge of society." ("Rectify the Party's Style of Work") It reveals in a profound manner the general laws governing nature, human society and the development of thought. Because of this, Marxist philosophy provides the proletariat with the only correct world outlook and methodology for knowing and changing the world, and supplies a sharp ideological weapon for the study of natural science. Of course, the various concrete branches of science have their own specific subjects of research and must solve their own specific contradictions. Marxist philosophy should not and cannot replace the research of all concrete branches of science and solve the various concrete problems on their behalf. However, this does not mean that we can negate the role of Marxist philosophy as the guide to all the specific branches of science. The dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge tells us that man's knowledge always consists of two inter-related processes, namely, from the particular to the general and from the general to the particular. People always first get to know the peculiar nature of many different things before they proceed to do the work of generalization and find out the common nature of things. When this common nature is recognized, such common knowledge then becomes a guide for continuing study of various concrete things. Such is the case with Marxist philosophy. Since it is the generalization of the knowledge of the common nature of all branches of science, natural science included, it is capable of grasping the nature of things more profoundly, accurately and completely than the various concrete branches of science, and of course it can become the guide

to the study of natural science. Only when workers of natural science accept this guidance can they follow a correct orientation, carry out their own particular scientific research and solve its peculiar contradictions.

To tamper with the spiritual substance of Marxism, revisionists, both new and old, often raise the red flag to oppose the red flag and quote out of context some Marxist phrases to defend their own reactionary words and deeds. This is also true of people stirring up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts. Partially citing Chairman Mao's thesis on the relationship between Marxism and natural science, they vainly attempt to prove their own revisionist viewpoint. But we need only to read seriously Chairman Mao's brilliant work "Talks at the Yenan Forum on Literature and Art" to see clearly that what Chairman Mao says about Marxism embracing and not replacing natural science is precisely aimed at refuting the erroneous view that literature and art can be divorced from politics and Marxism "harms the creative mood" as well as stressing the role of Marxism as the guide. Chairman Mao points out emphatically: "The science of Marxism-Leninism must be studied by all revolutionaries." All revolutionaries must learn to "apply the dialectical materialist and historical materialist viewpoint in our observation of the world, of society." But people stirring up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts mention only "cannot replace" and not "embrace," and describe the guidance of Marxism as "hindering" or "undermining" the study of natural science. Isn't such a view a reprint of the fallacy that Marxism "harms the creative mood" that in former years was criticized by Chairman Mao? Their tricks backfire. What they originally intended to do is to use this remark by Chairman Mao as a shield against Marxism, but the result is that they lifted a rock only to have it drop on their own feet, and their revisionist features are glaringly exposed.

Natural science has never been separated from the guidance of philosophy and has always been dominated by philosophy. As early as the 19th century Engels criticized the erroneous tendency on the part of natural scientists to neglect philosophy and attempt to free themselves from philosophy. He said: "Natural scientists may adopt whatever attitude they please, they are still under the domination of philosophy. It is only a question whether they want to be dominated by a bad, fashionable philosophy or by a form of theoretical thought which rests on acquaintance with the history of thought and its achievements." (Dialectics of Nature) As in the case of other endeavors of research, research in natural science cannot be separated from a definite world outlook and methodology. A definite world outlook and methodology invariably serve the interests of a definite class. Scholars in the pay of the bourgeoisie claim that philosophy hinders science and call for the separation of science from philosophy, while in plain truth they merely want to free themselves from materialism and dialectics and accept idealism and metaphysics. By negating the need for natural science to accept the guidance of Marxism, people stirring up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts actually want people to accept idealism and metaphysics and draw the study of natural science into the orbit of revisionism.

In order to oppose the guidance of Marxist philosophy, people stirring up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts also bring out some achievements of certain bourgeois natural scientists as the basis for peddling such platitudes as "pure science" and "vocational work first" with the aim of deceiving those muddle-headed people. But the laws of the development of natural science completely puncture their fraud.

The history of natural science tells us that the reason why certain bourgeois natural scientists were able to achieve something was that in the course of scientific research they applied the materialist and dialectical thought on certain problems. For instance, Newton was able to discover the three major laws of classical mechanics and the law of universal gravitation and discovered the law of mechanical motion because he stuck to spontaneous materialism and recognized the objectivity of matter. In his early days Kant was able to put forward the "nebular theory," a theory of tremendous value concerning the evolution of the heavenly body, because he had a definite materialist and dialectical thought and proceeded from the contradictory motion of the planet itself. A great number of facts show that dialectical materialism is the only correct world outlook guiding the advance of natural science and that the development of natural science unceasingly confirms and enriches Marxist philosophy. As Lenin said: "The latest discoveries of natural science--radium, electrons, the transmutation of elements--have remarkably confirmed Marx's dialectical materialism." ("The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism") Natural science, once it departs from dialectical materialism, will surely go astray. When analyzing the state of 19th-century natural science, Engels pointed out that the development of natural science itself had already broken the metaphysical outlook of nature and reached a dialectical conclusion, and "if study were to continue resolutely in this direction, then natural science would have developed more substantially today." (Dialectics of Nature) However, at that time some natural scientists, suffering from the limitation of historical and class conditions, could only spontaneously, and not consciously, apply materialism and dialectics, with the result that their scientific research was subjected to considerable restriction, such that they could not but take a long, devious and paintful journey in their research work. Many were confused ideologically and lost their ability to tell what was correct from what was wrong; even when truth touched the tip of their nose, they still failed to see it, and all they did was to grope in the dark. Not only that, but many were unable to resist the invasion of religion and idealism without the guidance of a correct philosophical thought and eventually became their prisoners and embarked on the wrong path. Newton made his contribution to mechanics, but under the domination of mechanism and the metaphysical world outlook, he developed from believing in the existence of an absolute state of rest to acknowledging "God's first propulsion" and slipped into the quagmire of idealism and spiritualism. In physics Einstein advanced the theory of relativity reflecting the law of high-speed motion, but in the matter of world outlook he accepted the reactionary Machism and finally arrived at the erroneous conclusion on the "finity of the universe." In the early 20th century, discoveries of X-ray, Becquerel's ray, radium and electrons in physics were colossal scientific achievements, yet many physicists who lacked the dialectical thought failed to see their revolutionary significance and instead described them as "the crisis in physics," saying such nonsense as "the atom is non-material" and "matter vanishes." This gave direct help to the reactionary idealism, and some of them even embarked on the road against science. Today, in the Soviet Union, due to the full-scale restoration

of capitalism, many natural scientists have abandoned dialectical materialism, with some even degenerating to such an extent that they use science and technology to study "the human mind" and "the reproduction of genius." They propagate such idealist fallacies as the "energy theory," embark on the road in betrayal of Marxism, and gravely hinder the development of science.

Historical facts eloquently confirm Lenin's brilliant thesis: "Without a fully reliable philosophical basis, no natural science or materialism can persist in the fight against the invasion of bourgeois ideology and the restoration of the bourgeois world outlook. In order to persist in this fight and carry it through to its victorious completion, a natural scientist should become a modern materialist, a conscientious champion of materialism represented by Marx, a dialectical materialist." ("On the Significance of Militant Materialism")

A salient characteristic of Marxist philosophy is its clear-cut class character. To grasp it and to become a conscientious dialectical materialist, a scientific worker must seriously study Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, change his class stand, and make a hard effort to transform his world outlook. Not only does scientific research itself require the guidance of dialectical materialism, but every scientific worker faces a question of whom to serve and how and, to solve this question, needs the guidance of Marxism even more. We are a socialist country under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Our science and technology can only serve the proletariat and the working people and serve the dictatorship of the proletariat, and must never serve the bourgeoisie and revisionism. This demands that our scientific and technological personnel truly move over to the side of the proletariat and the working people, take the road of integrating themselves with the workers and peasants, persist in the correct orientation of open-door scientific research and letting the masses manage scientific research, and make science and technology a tool for the dictatorship of the proletariat. That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party opposes any discussion of the dictatorship of the proletariat in scientific and technological circles, opposes the study of Marxism by workers of natural science, and slanders the study of Marxism-Leninism and participation in political activities as "harsh levies and taxes." In addition, he says ludicrously that "'white and expert' is good for the Chinese People's Republic," and he is against intellectuals transforming their world outlook and vainly attempts to lead the scientific and technological personnel onto the revisionist road of being white and expert. These fallacies of theirs are nothing new; they are merely a reprint of that revisionist package including "pure science" and "vocational work first" that had long ago been criticized during the great cultural revolution. Their basic aim is to abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore capitalism. If this revisionist line were allowed to succeed, our socialist mother country would repeat the mistakes of the Soviet Union where "the satellite goes up to the sky, the red flag plummets to the ground." This would benefit only the landlord and bourgeois classes and imperialism and would be a grave disaster to the proletariat and the working people!

To oppose the guidance of Marxism, people stirring up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts also resort to the despicable tactics used by bourgeois Rightists to attack the Party in 1957. They cry aloud that

it is impossible to use Marxist philosophy to solve "the concrete debate of a philosophical nature within the framework of natural science." They slander the use of dialectical materialism to analyze these controversies as "logical extension simply by quoting a few sentences from classical works." They believe that the solution of such problems of a "philosophical nature" must "depend on publicly acknowledged conclusions derived from scientific experiment itself." While giving lip service to letting a hundred schools of thought contend, they are actually afraid that people may use Marxist philosophy to rebut idealism and metaphysics. This exposes once more their utter hostility to and extreme fear of Marxism.

We have always upheld the policy of letting a hundred schools of thought contend. We call for the solution of concrete problems in natural science through discussion and practice. We maintain that "different schools and trends in science can debate freely." However, while talking about letting a hundred schools of thought contend, we must not forget this basic question: "We advocate 'letting a hundred schools of thought contend," and in every branch of learning there may be many schools and trends; in the matter of world outlook, however, today there are basically only two schools, the proletarian and the bourgeois." ("Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work") When those who discuss letting a hundred schools of thought contend are afraid of and oppose the contention between Marxist philosophy and bourgeois philosophy, they really do not want letting a hundred schools of thought contend but want the garden of natural science to be filled with poisonous weeds. What is the debate of a "philosophical nature" within the scope of natural science? It is none other than the struggle between materialism and idealism, between dialectics and metaphysics. On the contention between these two basic philosophical lines, as far as a Marxist is concerned, what else can he rely on as a fighting weapon other than dialectical materialism, which is bitterly detested by the bourgeois philistines? In the late 19th century and early 20th century, in physics the two opposing schools, the materialist and the idealist, arrived at generally identical conclusions from their computation or experiment at the time of carrying out concrete scientific research. But on the question of whether theories of physics could reflect the objective world, they had basic differences in philosophy. And such differences in philosophy did not vanish because scientific experiment "gave rise to publicly acknowledged conclusions." The problem could be solved only by applying dialectical materialism to the refutation of idealism and metaphysics. When people stirring up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts say that the "concrete debate of a philosophical nature" must "depend on publicly acknowledged conclusion derived from scientific experiment itself" and so forth, they merely resort to the same old tricks of the Russian Machians in former years who obliterated the opposition between two basic philosophical lines with the concrete scientific "identity." If we are to correctly solve the theoretical problems in respect to world outlook in natural science as well as the concrete problems of scientific research, then we must use Marxist philosophy as the guide. Only when natural-scientific workers master dialectical materialism can they eschew idealism and metaphysics, take less detours, and conduct their own scientific research smoothly. Lenin pointed out: "By following the path of Marxist theory we shall draw closer and closer to objective truth (without ever exhausting it); but by following any other path we shall arrive at nothing but confusion and lies." (Materialism and Empirio-Criticism)

Teachers of proletarian revolution have always given extremely close attention to the struggle between two philosophical lines in natural science and, moreover, directly participated in the criticism of idealism and metaphysics. Applying the dialectical-materialist viewpoint, they made profound philosophical summation of the achievements of natural science and arrived at correct conclusions on many philosophical problems in natural science. Marx and Engels did not carry out any concrete experiment in determining the atomic weights, yet they set forth the important idea that "atoms are in no wise regarded as simple, or in general as the smallest known particles of matter." (Dialectics of Nature) Lenin did not take part in the experiment of observing the electrons, yet came to the splendid conclusion that "like atoms, electrons cannot be exhausted." Chairman Mao, applying materialist dialectics and on the basis of the principle that "everything is divided into two," generalizes the achievements in the study of basic particles and advanced the incisive thesis that basic particles are also infinitely divisible, thereby pointing out the direction for the study of physics. The achievements of natural science have confirmed and will continue to confirm that these brilliant theses by the teachers of revolution are absolutely correct. But in the eyes of people stirring up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, he who does not personally participate in scientific experiment has no right to take an interest in the philosophical debate within the framework of natural science. According to this logic, would we not basically negate the criticism of idealism in natural science made by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Chairman Mao and all the conclusions derived thereby? It is by no means accidental that they toss out these fallacies, which are of the same lineage as the other fallacies they advocate such as that power in science and technology should be held by "first-rate" "authorities" "publicly acknowledged in scientific and technological circles" and Party leadership over scientific and technological work should be abolished. This amply shows that they are ignorant of and oppose Marxism-Leninism and that they constitute the bourgeoisie within the Communist Party with the aim of restoring capitalism.

The scientific and technological sphere has always been a scene of violent struggle between materialism and idealism, between dialectics and metaphysic, and this struggle between two world outlooks is, in the last nalysis, a manifestation of the conflict of interests between two opposing classes. This is confirmed by innumerable facts in the history of natural science. The outstanding astronomer Copernicus, with his "heliocentric theory" which conforms to the natural features of the objective world, refuted Ptolemy's "geocentric theory." This fundamentally shook the foundation of rule of divine power in the Middle Ages and expressed the revolutionary will and aspirations of the bourgeoisie in its ascendancy. However, this revolutionary scientific theory was maliciously denigrated and attacked by the Christians, and Bruno, who further pushed forward the "heliocentric theory," was burned to death by the reactionary church. This fully explains the sharp and violent nature of class struggle in the scientific and technological domain. As Lenin pointed out: "There is a well-known saying that if geometrical axioms affected human interests,attempts would certainly be made to refute them. Theories of the natural sciences which conflict with the old prejudices of theology provoked, and still provoke, the most rabid opposition." ("Marxism and Revisionism") The reactionary classes, in order to safeguard

their interests, always cling to this position of natural science and, through their hired philosophers and natural scientists, distort and use the achievements of natural science to oppose materialism, extoll idealism, and incorporate all new discoveries and new achievements of science and technology into their reactionary politics which is opposed to social progress and revolutionary struggle. All opportunists and revisionists, from the revisionists of the Second International and Russian Machians to Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Liu Shao-ch'i, Lin Piao and their like, did their utmost to twist and use the achievements of natural science to attack Marxist philosophy and to create a theoretical basis for pushing their revisionist lines.

In socialist society, a fierce struggle between two lines and two world outlooks exists in the sphere of science and technology as in other spheres. The sphere of science and technology has for a long time been a hereditary domain of bourgeois intellectuals. After the great proletarian cultural revolution, the situation has taken a turn for the better, yet the bourgeoisie still uses its certain advantages in intellectual circles to have a trial of strength with the proletariat. The mass debate currently developing in educational, scientific-technological, and literary and art circles is a big battle between the two classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and deepens the struggle between Marxism and revisionism. That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party pushes on a general scale a revisionist line, which is the very opposite of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, in a forlorn attempt to negate the achievements of the great proletarian cultural revolution, oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat, and make science and technology depart from Marxism and serve the bourgeoisie anew. This is something the revolutionary people, including the vast numbers of revolutionary scientific and technological personnel, will never permit. In this struggle to hit back at the Right deviationist attempt to reverse verdicts, a struggle that bears on the future and destiny of the Party and state, we must take class struggle as the key link, stick to the Party's basic line, seriously study the theory of proletarian dictatorship, study Marxist philosophy, and read some history of philosophy. We must penetratingly criticize the bourgeoisie, criticize revisionism, and let Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought firmly occupy the scientific and technological domain.

* * *

We Must Never Take the White-and-Expert Road

by

Mass Criticism Group of Chungshan University

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

Where should we lead intellectuals to? To the Red-and-expert road or to the white-and-expert road? For a long time, this has been a sharp question over the contention between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat to win over the intelligentsia. Taking the bourgeois stand, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party stubbornly adheres to the revisionist line. Tossing out the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link," he negates class struggle as the key link and vigorously publicizes the white-and-expert road in a vain attempt to lead intellectuals to the evil road of capitalism. This is something our vast numbers of revolutionary intellectuals cannot tolerate.

That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party alleges absurdly that "those who are engaged in scientific research may be permitted to be book worms." What is meant by "book worm"? Should intellectuals become "book worms"? This is a question that must be made thoroughly clear. As a matter of fact, this slogan is not strange to us. In the 17 years before the great cultural revolution, dominated by the revisionist line, schools asked their students not to bother about proletarian politics but engross themselves in academic studies, "to close the two ears to events outside the window and to devotedly read books of the sages." Wasn't this intended to raise "book worms"? However, the course of raising such "book worms" was permeated with out-and-out bourgeois politics. From the objective of training to the content and methods of teaching, schools aimed at raising bourgeois spiritual aristocrats. Not to bother about politics but to be engrossed in academic studies--this actually subjected students to bourgeois enslavement and to being led by the bourgeoisie by the nose. As a result, the longer students read, the farther they moved away from the worker and peasant masses in sentiment. Their heads were filled with more bourgeois ideas. They would demand a higher price from the Party and the people, and some might even go over to the side opposite to the people. Quite evidently, "book worms" is merely a pronoun for bourgeois intellectuals. The proletariat has publicly stated its viewpoint: "Education must serve proletarian politics and be combined with productive labor;" a school should bring up "workers with both socialist consciousness and culture;" and successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat must, in the violent struggle between the two classes, two roads and two lines, work for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the building of socialism and fight for the fulfillment of the historical mission of the proletariat. However, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party asks intellectuals not to bother about proletarian politics, not to integrate themselves with the worker and peasant masses, not to take part in social practice and not to transform their world outlook but to become "book worms." This is an attempt to reverse the verdicts of the great cultural revolution, restore the domination of the revisionist line in schools and turn young students into docile tools for capitalist restoration.

While opposing "book worms," we do not in the least encourage "not reading books," as that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party charges. The question is not whether to read or not to read, but what and how to read and for which class. This is the crux of the matter. Books have a strong class content; some correctly sum up the rich experiences accumulated by the proletariat and the working people in class and production struggles, others propagate or are permeated with the ideological poisons and prejudices of exploiting classes. It is necessary for us to adopt different attitudes toward different books and different contents of books. We must read ready-made books in an analytical and discriminating manner. At the same time, we read books for the revolution, for solving practical problems arising from the three great revolutionary movements. Only by linking our reading to reality and personally participating in the social practice of changing reality can we gain all-round knowledge and bring up workers with both socialist consciousness and culture. But that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party is silent about how to read and for which class, and instead, energetically encourages us to become "book worms." This is an attempt to obliterate the class character of books and to ask people to study those poisonous weeds of feudalism, capitalism and revisionism and become captives of bourgeois ideology. Actually, this is no more than a reprint of the reactionary political views of Hu Shih and other comprador bourgeois men of letters who contended that "one should study more about problems and less about 'isms'," and is used against the proletariat and Marxism.

As we must raise Red and expert successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat, we must carry out a revolution in education. Since the great proletarian cultural revolution started, the masses of revolutionary teachers and students have, led by Chairman Mao's "May 7 directive," practiced open-door education, taking the road of integrating with the practice of the three major revolutionary movements and with the worker and peasant masses. They have gained very impressive results. However, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party says that this is a plain "waste of a great deal of time."

After all, is time wasted by "open door" or by "closed door"? In the 17 years of rule by the revisionist line, the doors of schools were tightly bolted. Once students entered a school, they were locked up in the campus and spent their time moving around "dormitory--classroom--library." They studied rigidly and learned by rote. In this way, the school was divorced from the seething social life, teaching from the practice of the three major revolutionary movements, and teachers and students from workers and peasants. A lot of useless things were taught. For example, in teaching microbiology, lengthy discussion centered on the microbe distribution in the air over Moscow. In teaching meteorology, the "air mass of the Soviet Union" became a subject of lengthy discussion. Even such meaningless and trivial things as "the function of a horse tail" were discussed. Wasn't this plain "waste of a great deal of time"? As for the good experiences of predecessors summed up in books, because they were not related to practice, the students did not know how to apply them to practice after they were taught and had to study again. Wasn't this plain "waste of a great deal of time"? Although old schools offered four, five or even seven or eight-year courses and although dozens of subjects were taught and piles of books were read, students did not acquire much knowledge, and some even had their health ruined. In all the "17 years," more useful people would have been trained

and China's science and technology would have been developed more rapidly had the many universities not been dominated by the revisionist line. It should be said that what plainly wasted a lot of time of the students was not the proletarian educational revolution but that revisionist educational line. After open-door education was introduced, we have persisted in integrating education with productive labor and theory with practice, and organized teaching in connection with typical products and fighting tasks. We have enabled students not only to gain knowledge on the basis of combining theory with practice but also to solve some practical problems in socialist construction. For example, teachers and students of the rare metal chemistry specialty of the department of metallurgy in our university, holding open classes in related factories, not only learned from the revolutionary spirit of the working class in sharing the urgent desires of the state and boldly blazing new trails, but also diligently delved into theories in light of reality, boldly carried out innovations in technological processes, and finally succeeded in the experiment of using a powerful electric current for the manufacture of spongy titanium by electrolysis, with the rate of recovery, the rate of acceptancy, and the power efficiency all reaching advanced levels. Many facts in the educational revolution amply explain that running schools along the May-7 road indicated by Chairman Mao enables the students to learn better and more than they did in the past, and this basically is not a plain waste of time but a saving in time. That unrepentant capitalist roader, blind to iron-clad facts, arbitrarily insists that open-door education is a plain waste of time, thus showing how stiff his opposition to the educational revolution is! Historical experience merits attention. In the past, Liu Shao-ch'i and company strangled the 1958 educational revolution by peddling the revisionist contraband such as "intellectual education first" and the white and expert road. Today, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party picks up this worn-out weapon in an attempt to completely negate the fruits of the proletarian revolution in education and to restore that revisionist educational system of "17 years." We must go the other way, go on developing the proletarian revolution in education, persist in open-door education, keep integrating with the workers and peasants and the practice of the three major revolutionary movements, and take the red and expert road now and forever!

The unrepentant capitalist roaders within the Party say that because we have not taken the white and expert road, "so we are technically backward." They accuse us of being incapable of scaling the high peak of science. "You can't scale the middle peak either, or probably the low peak too." This is sheer nonsense. When it comes to scientific research, it is imperative to solve the problem of goal and orientation. Do we undertake scientific research for the sake of socialist revolution and construction or for the sake of personal fame and gain? This is a fundamental question that must be faced and settled by scientific researchers. People taking the white and expert road always think of personal fame and gain and can hardly be expected to work for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the development of the socialist economic base. When their desire for personal fame and gain could not be satisfied, they would go against and oppose the socialist system, to say nothing of developing their socialist enthusiasm. How, then, can they contribute to the development of science and technology? Taking the white and expert road will enevitably cause such bourgeois ideas as struggle for fame and gain and vindication

of one's sectarian view to spread unchecked. A situation will be created in which people fight for the right to give orders in cooperative undertakings, choose the easier and more lucrative jobs, monopolize the data, and keep their experiences from others. How can this contribute to the development of science and technology? Since those taking the white and expert road bury their heads in reference material rooms and libraries and are reluctant to go among the broad masses of people, it is impossible for them to absorb the wisdom of the masses or to sum up their experiences. When the fountainhead is lost, how can the development of science and technology be enhanced? In a socialist country, taking the white and expert road can only hinder the advance of science and technology and the scaling of the high peak of science. Such examples are too numerous to mention in the dozen years prior to the great cultural revolution. In those days, for instance, some people in our university spread such fallacies as "he who is good politically doesn't go to a law court, and he who is healthy doesn't go to a hospital. But to be good vocationally, one must go to a scientific institute." Some people said, "Just as one must go to heaven, one must make a name for oneself in this world or die with regret." They depicted participation in political activities as a fresh flower which, though it looks beautiful for a time, will eventually wither. But, they said, any solid fruit produced by arduous academic research would stand like a monument to behold for a thousand years. And so on and so forth. Such reactionary views about taking the white and expert road had poisoned many, causing them to fall into a quagmire against the Party and the people instead of erecting a monument or ascending to the blue heaven. How could such students contribute to the development of science and technology?

Facts have confirmed that taking the white and expert road basically makes it impossible to scale the high peak of science and technology for the revolution, and that only by persisting in being Red and expert can we promote the progress of science and technology. For instance, students of the 1972 graduating class of the mechanics specialty of the department of mathematics and mechanics, in the course of designing a fine ship propeller, firmly grasped the education in ideology and political line from beginning to end. Taught by the workers, poor and lower-middle fishermen and PLA comrades, they deeply realized that designing a fine propeller must be accompanied by a persistent fight against the revisionist educational and scientific research lines,against the slavish comprador philosophy and against the doctrine of crawling behind others at a snail's pace. They delved into the cyclodial theory and other basic mathematical theories, and carried out an in-depth study and analysis of foreign advanced methods of designing propellers and their performance. At the same time, they seriously studied and summed up the rich experiences of the masses in designing and manufacturing propellers. They finally designed and manufactured a variable pitch propeller, which,as tests showed, reached the advanced level both in cruising speed and in propulsion power. This is a forceful rebuff to the white and expert road advocated by unrepentant capitalist roaders within the Party. Of course, science and technology in our country are still relatively backward, but an important cause for this backwardness is precisely the sabotage and interference by the revisionist line. For this reason, we must thoroughly repudiate the white and expert road. Under the Party's leadership, we must take class struggle as the key link, stick to the Party's basic line, practice integration between professionals and the masses, unfold mass movements

in a big way, and promote the development of science and technology in our country. We believe that "nothing is hard in this world if you dare to scale the heights." With the guidance of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, China's science and technology will certainly catch up with and surpass the world's advanced levels.

One of the profound lessons provided by the great proletarian cultural revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius is that we perceive the danger of not paying attention to politics but burying our heads in vocational work and becoming "book worms," the hypocritical and reactionary nature of the white and expert road, which in reality is a capitalist road, a road we must never take. Guided by Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, our vast numbers of intellectuals and young students must positively take part in the great struggle to strike back at the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, further promote the deep-going development of the educational revolution, and always march forward on the royal road of being Red and expert!

* * *

In Learning from Tachai, We Must Take Class Struggle as Key Link

by

Lu Yang (路 阳)

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

After the great proletarian cultural revolution, the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius and the movement to study the theory of proletarian dictatorship, the mass movement to learn from Tachai in agriculture is developing with vigor, and advanced units continue to emerge. The situation is excellent. However, on the question of learning from Tachai, a serious struggle still goes on. In order to push the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link" and restore capitalism in the countryside, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party does his utmost to distort Tachai's experience and negate class struggle as the key link in a forlorn attempt to draw the movement to learn from Tachai in agriculture into the revisionist orbit.

Tachai is a red banner personally planted by the great leader Chairman Mao, a typical example of doggedly taking class struggle as the key link, doggedly adhering to the Party's basic line, doggedly continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and developing socialist agriculture with greater, faster, better and more economical results. Tachai has always given first priority to educating peasants in Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, striving to eliminate the ideological influence of the exploiting class and the traditional concept of small production. It has adhered to the Party's basic line and unceasingly waged a tit-for-tat struggle against revisionism and capitalism in consolidating and developing the socialist collective economy. It has unfolded in depth the revolution in the superstructure and in the relations of production, heedful of restricting bourgeois rights and exercising all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie. If Tachai's rich experience is summed up in one point, it is this: It has always grasped class struggle, the key link, in roundly criticizing revisionism and capitalism and vigorously building socialism. In learning from Tachai in agriculture, the first and primary thing is to study this fundamental experience and solve properly the question of orientation and road in agricultural development.

That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party takes over the slogan of learning from Tachai in agriculture, but expunges the most basic thing from Tachai's experience and "commend those things that can be accepted or seemingly can be accepted by the bourgeoisie as things of first priority." While talking about learning from Tachai, he is silent about class struggle, the great proletarian cultural revolution and the movement to study the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Instead, he depicts learning from Tachai as "to work in a practical manner." Thus, to learn from Tachai is just to learn how to "work." This is a most despicable distortion of the movement to learn from Tachai in agriculture.

The movement to learn from Tachai in agriculture is a deep-going socialist revolution, a great struggle for the proletariat to triumph over the

bourgeoisie, socialism to triumph over capitalism and Marxism to triumph over revisionism in the countryside. To conduct such a great revolutionary movement, if we do not firmly grasp the key link, class struggle, we cannot make it develop healthily in a correct direction. The Party's basic line tells us that throughout the historical period of socialism there are classes, class contradictions and class struggle, there is struggle between the socialist and the capitalist roads,and there is the danger of capitalist restoration. The principal contradiction in the countryside is the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, a contradiction which cannot be solved overnight. With agricultural cooperativization and the formation of people's communes, the masses of peasants have embarked on the road to socialist collectivization, yet the socialist revolution in the superstructure and in the relations of production is far from being completed. How to keep to the Party's basic line and persist in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat; how to rely on the masses of poor and lower-middle peasants, correctly handle the two different types of contradictions in the countryside, hit out at the disruptive activities of the class enemy, criticize capitalist tendencies and doggedly follow the socialist road; how to persist in applying Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to educating peasants to rid them of the bonds of old ideas and traditional concepts; how to actively create conditions for restricting bourgeois rights, gradually digging up the soil engendering capitalism and narrowing the three major differences; how to implement in the countryside the policy of "grasping revolution and promoting production, other work and preparedness against war"; and so on and so forth--all these remain very formidable and important revolutionary tasks confronting the Chinese countryside. These tasks call for long and arduous efforts on our part before they can be gradually realized. We must soberly see that in our countryside people of the overthrown exploiting class are still around and the class is still around and they are constantly dreaming of a comeback. There still exist the soil and conditions engendering capitalism and new bourgeois elements and a class basis for capitalist restoration. The influence of small production is still widely felt, a part of rich peasants are still more seriously afflicted with capitalist spontaneous tendencies, and some people are ever ready to leave the socialist path. Among a section of Party members and a section of cadres there are people who follow the bourgeois style of life, and some have even degenerated into new bourgeois elements. Within the collective economy, the question of whether to stick to socialist principles or to promote capitalist activities in the name of the collective economy has yet to be solved in respect to production, distribution and exchange. All of this shows that the struggle between the two classes, two roads and two lines in the countryside is still protracted, complicated and at times may even become very acute. If we do not persist in taking class struggle as the key link nor strengthen the all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie, agricultural development will run awry.

In learning from Tachai, we must work hard. But only when we take class struggle as the key link, persistently put proletarian politics in command, criticize revisionism and capitalist tendencies and give full play to the socialist activism of both cadres and the masses can we have a direction and a driving force for work. The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything. Only when the line is correct and the socialist activism of the masses brought into play can

we become more interested in work, more daring and more capable. Since Chairman Mao issued the call to learn from Tachai in agriculture in 1964 and through the great cultural revolution, the situation in our countryside has been excellent. The socialist position has been more consolidated, the collective economy has developed continuously, and bumper harvests in grain have been reaped for years running. All of this has resulted from the efforts of cadres and the poor and lower-middle peasants to implement the policy of grasping revolution and promoting production in conformity with Chairman Mao's teaching--"never forget classes and class struggle"--and to grasp the principal contradiction in the countryside and unfold socialist revolution in depth. If we do not grasp class struggle as the key link, do not criticize the revisionist line, and do not criticize capitalist tendencies, then the mass socialist activism cannot be called into play, the capitalist road cannot be blocked, and we cannot march toward socialism in big strides. In the past, under the pernicious influence of the revisionist line of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, some units "called for hard work but did not grasp the key link and the line," and as a result, people were disorganized and the orientation was wrong. There was no way to work, and people were liable to go to the evil capitalist road. Today, there are many reasons why some units have failed to learn from Tachai properly, but the most important one is still that they have not grasped class struggle as the key link. Both positive and negative experiences tell us that in learning from Tachai, we must, like Tachai, keep a tight grip on class struggle as the key link, and only thus can we learn from it well.

That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, in talking about "hard work," is silent about the Party's basic line and the need to grasp class struggle as the key link. What he means by "hard work" is that people should bury their heads in production, regardless of orientation and road and of "whether it is a white cat or a black cat, it is a good cat so long as it catches mice." If things were done his way, the countryside would naturally head toward the road of capitalist restoration. What he means by "agricultural adjustment" is that the basic experience of Tachai and the key link, class struggle, should be "adjusted" and that the movement to learn from Tachai in agriculture should be "adjusted" and taken onto the evil revisionist road.

Tachai's experience tells us that to consolidate the rural socialist position and guard against capitalist restoration, we must make a point of studying and solving the problems in the superstructure and the relations of production in the countryside. There is harmony as well as contradiction between the relations of production and the productive forces, between the superstructure and the economic base in our countryside. Chairman Mao points out: "In a word, China is a socialist country. Before liberation, she was much the same as a capitalist country. Even now she practices an eight-grade wage system, distribution according to work and exchange through money, and in all this differs little from the old society. What is different is that the system of ownership has been changed." In the countryside, bourgeois rights have not been completely abolished in the system of ownership; they still exist to a serious extent in the mutual relations of men and still occupy a dominating position in distribution. The existence of bourgeois rights cannot be avoided in the period of socialism, but they must be "restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat."

If they are not restricted, they will become a stumbling block to the development of new socialist things, add to the soil engendering capitalism, and create conditions for capitalist restoration. Therefore, to seriously study and adopt practical measures to restrict bourgeois rights in accordance with Chairman Mao's important instruction on the question of theory is an important task in the movement to learn from Tachai in agriculture. In addition, there is harmony as well as contradiction between the superstructure and the economic base. After successive revolutionary movements, the socialist ideological position in the rural areas has been continuously developed, consolidated and expanded, but the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius and other exploiting-class ideas still corrupt the peasants and hinder the development of the socialist cause. The exploiting-class ideas constitute the ideological foundation of capitalist restoration. To unfold in depth the revolution in the superstructure, to continuously strengthen political and ideological education among peasants, and to criticize the revisionist line and the ideologies of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes will provide an important guarantee for promoting the development of agriculture in the socialist direction, and this is also an important aspect of the movement to learn from Tachai in agriculture. In learning from Tachai, we must study the experience in this respect.

But that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party goes all out to oppose studying Tachai's important experience in this respect. He deeply resents the various new socialist things which help restrict bourgeois rights in the countryside. He slanderously charges that restriction of bourgeois rights lacks a "material basis." This fallacy runs completely counter to the revolutionary practice of the broad masses of peasants. Since the great cultural revolution, Tachai and many advanced units in learning from Tachai have accumulated a great deal of experience in restricting bourgeois rights. For instance, they give full play to the superiority of the people's commune which is large in size and has a high degree of public ownership, energetically develop the enterprises run by the commune and its brigades, continue to raise the percentage of ownership of the production brigades and the commune and gradually narrow the differences between brigades; cadres persist in taking part in collective productive labor, treat others on an equal footing and become one with the masses; in distribution, they persist in putting proletarian politics in command, correctly handle the three-way relations among the state, the collective and the individual and, with the development of production and the increase of income, appropriately raise the percentage of accumulation and gradually narrow the differences in income between commune members. They penetratingly develop the revolution in the superstructure, fervently support new socialist things, establish theoretical contingents of poor and lower-middle peasants, show concern for the growth of rusticated educated young people, develop the cooperative medical service and train barefoot doctors; and so on and so forth. This shows that to seriously study and adopt positive measures to restrict bourgeois rights with actual local conditions in mind is not only necessary but also possible. The fact that that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party slanders the restriction of bourgeois rights as without a "material basis" precisely explains that though he has entered the stage of socialist revolution in a physical sense, his thinking still stays behind at the stage of bourgeois

democratic revolution. It shows that because he represents the bourgeoisie, he must defend and strengthen bourgeois rights and uphold the basis on which the survival of the bourgeoisie depends.

That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party also distorts Tachai's experience, sets class struggle against the realization of agricultural modernization, and puts the latter above everything else. This is one side of him in disrupting the movement to learn from Tachai in agriculture in an attempt to lead it astray.

Agricultural modernization has a class character. There are many kinds of agricultural modernization in the world. There is socialist agricultural modernization as well as capitalist agricultural modernization. The former serves the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the in-depth conduct of socialist revolution; the latter is a means for the bourgeoisie to oppress and exploit the broad masses of laboring people. The two are diametrically opposed to each other. But that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party keeps his mouth shut about class struggle and says nothing about the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat or about persistence in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. In talking about agricultural modernization in complete disregard for the essential difference between Marxism and revisionism and between socialism and imperialism, he wants no more than restoring capitalism in the name of modernization. What he wants is capitalist and revisionist modernization. Liu Shao-ch'i once used the revisionist fallacy of "mechanization first and cooperativization later" to oppose cooperativization and the socialist revolution. By negating class struggle as the key link in talking about modernization, that unrepentant capitalist roader has inherited the mantle from Liu Shao-ch'i, and similarly aims to disrupt the socialist revolution in the countryside and put agriculture on the capitalist track.

Chairman Mao teaches us: "Class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it." The relationship between class struggle and modernization must be such that the former commands the latter. They cannot be reversed nor put on a par, still less is it permissible to use modernization to negate and obliterate class struggle by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. To speed up agricultural modernizationon on the basis of continued consolidation and development of agricultural collectivization is an important step to develop our socialist agriculture. We must achieve the modernization of our country's agriculture and equip it with more modern machines, chemical fertilizers, insecticides and modern science and technology, so that it will develop still faster. However, like all other work in the countryside, agricultural modernization is dominated and restricted by the principal contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. This principal contradiction decides all work in the countryside as well as the development of agricultural modernization. In the article "On the Question of Agricultural Cooperation," Chairman Mao pointed out long ago: "We are now carrying out a revolution not only in the social system, the change from private to public ownership, but also in technology, the change from handicraft to large-scale modern machine production, and the two revolutions are interconnected." Only when we grasp class struggle as the key link, implement the Party's basic line, unfold in depth the socialist revolution in the superstructure and in the relations of production and

correctly solve the question of orientation and road in agricultural development can we develop agricultural modernization rapidly. This is a basic experience in developing the modernization of socialist agriculture and building up a large-scale socialist agriculture. The Tachai brigade has advanced faster on the road of agricultural modernization because it has grasped class struggle as the key link and set straight the relationship between revolution and modernization. It has seriously carried out the Party's basic line, criticized and boycotted the revisionist line pushed by Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, and repudiated various capitalist tendencies on the question of agricultural modernization. Through continuous struggle, it has stuck to the socialist orientation, removed the sabotage and interference of the revisionist line, and implemented a series of principles and policies set by Chairman Mao on the realization of agricultural modernization. As a result, agricultural modernization has developed more rapidly. In learning from Tachai, we must also study its experience in correctly handling the relationship between class struggle and agricultural modernization.

On the question of agricultural modernization, as on other major problems of socialist construction, an acute struggle between the two classes and two roads has always existed. Should we persist in the socialist orientation or promote the revisionist package? Should we rely on the working class and the poor and lower-middle peasants and vigorously develop the mass movement or rely on a few? Should we uphold the policy of self-reliance and hard struggle or rely on the state, build something big, modern and complete and indulge in extravagance and waste? How should we use and manage farm machinery? On all these questions, the struggle has been very sharp all along. If they are not solved modernization will be denied a correct direction and will not develop. Even if it develops for the time being, it cannot achieve the purpose of serving the development of socialist agriculture. Why is it that agricultural modernization, which developed tardily before the great cultural revolution, has developed very rapidly after the great cultural revolution? The basic reason is that through the great proletarian cultural revolution, the two bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao were smashed, the revisionist line pushed by them was criticized in depth, a series of directives given by Chairman Mao on the question of agricultural modernization have been firmly carried out, and the activism of the working class and the broad masses of peasants for promoting socialist agricultural modernization has been brought into play. The class struggle waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is a tremendous driving force behind the development of agricultural modernization. Provided that class struggle, the key link, is grasped, proletarian politics is put in command, the revisionist line is criticized and things are done according to Chairman Mao's instructions, agricultural modernization in our country will surely develop very fast. Conversely, if we let that package peddled by that unrepentant capital roader within the Party prevail, the relations of production in our socialist agriculture will inevitably be damaged and realization of modernization of socialist agriculture will be impossible.

The great struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts is developing triumphantly. Let us, under the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, seriously study Chairman Mao's important instructions, firmly grasp class struggle as the

key link, adhere to the Party's basic line, penetratingly criticize that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party and the revisionist line he pushes, keep to the policy of grasping revolution and promoting production, do a good job in spring farming, and develop the mass movement to learn from Tachai in agriculture and build Tachai-type counties throughout the country more extensively and intensively.

* * *

The Battle Song for Independence and Self-Reliance

- Ode to a group of scientific-educational films shown in recent years

by

Hung Sung (洪 松)

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

In recent years, Chinese scientific-educational film workers, guided by Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, have created and produced a group of new scientific-educational films. These films vividly reflect the new achievements made in China's industrial and agricultural production and scientific-technological development, unfold an excellent situation in socialist revolution and socialist construction, and provide our vast masses of workers, peasants and soldiers and revolutionary scientific-technological personnel an inspiring battle song for independence and self-reliance.

Whether to persist in independence and self-reliance or promote the slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of crawling behind others at a snail's pace is a question of line. One of the important aims of that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party in stirring up the Right deviationist wind is to reverse the verdict on the slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of crawling behind others at a snail's pace that were totally discredited by the revolutionary people long ago. However, "reversing verdicts goes against the will of the people," and the vast revolutionary masses, revolutionary intellectuals and revolutionary cadres want progress and revolution. Such films as "The 10,000-h.p. Marine Engine," "Steel Refining by Oxygen Blowing in Open-hearth Furnace," "Exploration for Petroleum," "Happy To See the Light," "Afforestation on a Desert," and "Growing Apples in Rice Fields" faithfully record the militant course in which independence and self-reliance continue to triumph over the doctrine of crawling behind others at a snail's pace and the slavish comrador philosophy.

Among these, "The 10,000-h.p. Marine Engine" is a film highly representative in character. The marine heavy-duty, low-speed 10,000-h.p. diesel engine is the heart of a 10,000-ton ocean-going freighter, and the manufacturing technology is relatively complicated. The great cultural revolution paved the way for the Chinese workers to manufacture the 10,000-h.p. marine engine by their own efforts. However, on a series of questions such as whether and how to manufacture it, a tit-for-tat struggle has always been waged between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The capitalist roaders who worshipped the slavish comprador philosophy first advocated "building ships is no better than buying ships, and buying ships is no better than chartering ships" in order to strangle the revolutionary pioneering spirit of shipbuilders. Then, peddling the slavish comprador philosophy, they declared that "the breakdown of home-made engines is bound to happen, while any breakdown of foreign engines will only be accidental"; they found faults with the home-made engine and its components in various ways and condemned them. Finally, they said that a home-made 10,000-ton freighter,

"while it may be allowed to sail along the coast, must not be allowed to sail across the ocean," and unreasonably forbade a home-made 10,000-ton freighter to sail across the ocean. Our heroic shipbuilders, repeatedly dealing head-on blows to the revisionist line which challenged them, finally produced our own 10,000-h.p. engine, won the ocean-going right for the home-made 10,000-ton freighter, and administered a powerful rebuff to those advocates of the slavish comprador philosophy. The film particularly relates the sharp struggle over the large crankshaft, the principal component of the 10,000-h.p. engine. Long before the great cultural revolution, the workers, making revolution in the mattress sheds, solved one major technical problem after another and produced China's first large crankshaft. Its chemical elements and mechanical performance fully conformed to the standard set. However, some people who were obsessed with the slavish comprador philosophy pronounced a death sentence on this crankshaft on the pretext that this home-made crankshaft had a few pockmarks on its surface and the quality of its outward appearance did not come up to standard. As a result, the hull of the ocean-going freighter produced by our country was kept under water for five full years. It was not until the great cultural revolution that the workers exonerated this crankshaft and installed it on a home-made 10,000-ton oil tanker. Up to now this tanker has been sailing safely on the seas for more than six years. When the screen shows the return of the first home-made ocean-going freighter from its distant trip, the narrator reads aloud Chairman Mao's teaching: "Are the Chinese laboring people still so slavish as they were before? No, not anymore. They have become masters." How can the revolutionary audience refrain from feeling proud from the bottom of their hearts at seeing this?

That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party himself is a fanatical advocate of the slavish comprador philosophy. Wherever he goes he says it is necessary to "import foreign technology and equipment," going so far as to stress that this is a "major policy." This is open opposition to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. Chairman Mao points out: "Rely mainly on our own efforts while making external assistance subsidiary, break down blind faith, go in for industry, agriculture and technical and cultural revolutions independently, do away with slavishness, bury dogmatism, learn from the good experience of other countries conscientiously, and be sure to study their bad experience too, so as to draw lessons from it. This is our line." This line set forth by Chairman Mao enabled us to overcome the imperialist blockade, resist the social-imperialist pressure, and develop the Chinese economy realistically and substantially in spite of storms of economic crises of the capitalist world. By proposing the so-called "major policy," that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party actually attempts to interfere with and prevent our economy from developing forward along Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. The film "Steel Refining by Oxygen Blowing in Open-hearth Furnace" demonstrates the success of steel workers in applying the new technology of steel refining by oxygen blowing in open-hearth furnace. While it boosts the morale of revolutionary people and deflates the arrogance of the bourgeoisie, it also powerfully rebuts that so-called "major policy." Oxygen blowing requires an oxygen gun, and the foreign capitalists regard it as a "patent" and impose a blockade on us. Parroting these foreign capitalists, some people also said that we did not have the

ability to make such a structurally complicated oxygen gun. However, the steel workers, believing in neither gods nor ghosts, strongly criticized the idea of worshipping things foreign. Brave in carrying out innovation and creating something, they finally produced an "honor-wining" gun after a number of experiments. This greatly reduces the time of steel refining, raises the output of steel, and beats out a new path for the technical transformation of China's medium-sized and small open-hearth furnaces. If we had relied on the "major policy" of that unrepentant capitalist roader and been blindly obsessed with "imports," wouldn't we be incapable of producing our own oxygen gun forever? As the workers said, such a "major policy" would put the rope of the foreign bourgeoisie around our necks!

In short, in the eyes of that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, the Chinese proletariat does worse than the foreign bourgeoisie in everything. In doing everything we have to immitate others and look up to others, and we should not dare even to dream of what foreign countries do not have. The screening of this group of films in recent years has made a ruthless mockery of this Chia Kuei /slavish comprador/ spirit. For instance, "Exploration for Petroleum" tells us that since the Western petroleum circles did not dare to use the technique of injecting water into oil wells early, wells generally were unable to spout owing to reduced pressure on the oil stratum. But the workers of Tach'ing, displaying the heroic spirit of "making oil flow fast and water flow slowly," boldly adopted this new technique and achieved stable and high output. For another instance, "Prevention of Silicon Dust in Factories" shows the many effective measures adopted by many industrial departments in the struggle against silicon dust harmful to the health of the workers and how these measures further promoted the technical innovation and led to the creation of a new technique of sandcasting without the use of sand. It may be asked: Why should the Chinese proletariat not be able to do what the foreign bourgeoisie cannot do? This is no bluffing; it has been confirmed by many living facts. We do not reject and oppose importing some necessary advanced equipment and technology that we can learn from, but under no circumstances must we purely rely on and worship them blindly. Nor should we apply foreign methods wholesale and mechanically; rather, in the light of the needs of our socialist system and the experience of our socialist construction, we should criticize and transform them where necessary. But that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party clings to his decadent philosophy that "no matter whether it is a white or black cat, it is a good cat that catches mice." He does his utmost to obliterate the basic differences between socialism and capitalism and between Marxism and revisionism. He praises foreign equipment and technology to the skies, and regards "import" as the cure-all medicine. The result of doing this is bound to "import" capitalism and revisionism as well as capitalist exploitation and oppression into socialist China, and if this state of affairs were allowed to go on, the whole of China would change its color before long.

One who admires and worships foreign things inevitably despises the creations of the masses of people in one's own country. That unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, who stirs up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, has no faith in the masses and no respect for the pioneering spirit of the masses, and vainly attempts to stifle the creativity of the masses. They keep saying that "relying on the workers, peasants and soldiers is relative," and they slanderously charge that the workers, peasants and soldiers have "too low a cultural level" and are not fit for scientific

research. Well then, let them open their eyes to the facts revealed by many scientific-educational films! From different angles these films reflect the wisdom, ingenuity and unlimited creative power of the Chinese workers and poor and lower-middle peasants, besides vividly showing the gratifying achievements made in scientific research by many scientific and technological personnel who have been tempered in the great cultural revolution and oriented themselves toward integrating with the workers and peasants. Apart from the above-mentioned films, the film "Earthquake" not only shows how the vast revolutionary masses, from workers to peasants and from children to old cooks, have untiringly over the years kept a watch over the earth crust activities by various indigenous methods, but it also shows how group after group of revolutionary geological workers are working among the masses and battling in the fields, carefully carrying out observations and tests. It is precisely because we have adhered to the path of integrating professional workers with the masses and implemented the policy of talking on two legs by combining indigenous with modern methods that the accuracy of earthquake forecasting and reporting has very quickly attained the world's advanced standard. In addition, such films as "The Box-type Solar Stove," "Humus Acid Fertilizer" and "Coal Slag Turned into Phosphate Fertilizer in a Power Plant," through reflecting the inventions and creations of the worker and peasant masses, repeatedly testify to the great truth that "the lowly are the most intelligent." As to the question whether the worker and peasant masses have "a low level" or those bourgeois overlords who think they are noble are the most stupid, an answer has been supplied by numerous facts. Is there any doubt about that?

In the final analysis, the policy of maintaining independence, keeping the initiative in our own hands and achieving regeneration through one's efforts is built on the foundation of historical materialism, calling for full faith in and reliance on the masses and developing their creative spirit. For this reason, to take the proletariat's own road of scientific and technological development, it is imperative to unfold mass scientific research and technical innovation under the guidance of the Marxist world outlook. In this respect, many scientific-educational films have rather unique features. For instance, "Weather Forecasting by Observing Clouds," while presenting mass activities of weather forecasting and reporting and the struggle against disastrous climate, profoundly repudiates the "theory of Heavenly will" and publicizes the viewpoint that man will triumph over nature. "A Small Hydro-Electric Power Station in a Mountain Village," by showing the heart-warming deeds in establishing a small hydro-electric power station in a mountainous region chronically short of water, propagates dialectics showing that if man's subjective initiative is brought into play in creating conditions, the water shortage can be overcome and plenty of water can be made available. "Innovation Carried Out in a Manner Suited to Local Conditions," through its description of a small factory which sets up an automatic production line in an extremely crammed building, lauds the idea that there is no limit to progress and potentials are inexhaustible.

This group of films shown in recent years tells us confidently that once the working class and the laboring people grasp the universal truth of dialectical materialism, they will open up a boundless path for knowing and changing the world and will certainly be able to catch up with and surpass the world's advanced levels in the not too distant future. Let those worshippers of the slavish comprador philosophy weep in a corner!

* * *

The Education and Training Given Me by the Revolution in Literature and Art

by

Yang Ch'un-hsia (杨春霞)

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

Last summer and fall, under the instigation of that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party, an adverse current emerged in literature and art circles which attacked model revolutionary theatrical works and lavished praise on the "17 years'" revisionist black line in literature and art. In order to give a positive assessment to this revisionist black line in literature and art, the bourgeoisie has gone so far as to nonsensically say that all those who perform for the model revolutionary theatrical works received their training during those "17 years." This is a vicious attack on the proletarian revolution in literature and art, and it is also a most serious slander against all of us fighters in literature and art who matured during this revolution.

The revolution in literature and art exemplified by the model revolutionary theatrical works not only generated good works and good experience but also produced a proletarian contingent in literature and art. After all, should these achievements be credited to the proletariat or to the bourgeoisie? Ought they be attributed to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in literature and art or to the "17 years'" black line in literature and art? Irreversibly, this is a major question of right and wrong. "Take, for example, peaches that grow on a tree; the peaches represent the fruit of victory. Who should pick those peaches? We must ask who planted and watered the tree." On this question, all of us fighters in literature and art have a personal understanding and are most entitled to speak.

I am a young actress trained by the Party. More than 20 years have elapsed since I began to study acting at the age of 11. During this period momentous changes that turned the world upside down have taken place in the realm of literature and art. In the past, the black line in literature and art turned me into a black ace for revisionism and pushed me down to the blind alley of revisionism. The great proletarian cultural revolution rescued me from the old fortress and Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in literature and art led me onto the golden highway of revolution and brought out my revolutionary and artistic youthfulness. As I weigh the new against the old, my emotions ebb and flow. I shall never forget the education and training received during the revolution in literature and art, nor shall I ever forget being enslaved and poisoned by the "17 years'" black line in literature and art.

In 1954, wearing a red scarf, I entered the Shanghai Drama School. However, the school, under the domination of the revisionist black line in literature and art, taught dramas about emperors, kings, generals, ministers, scholars and beauties; all it disseminated was the bourgeois fame and gain ideology like "acquire a new skill and travel around the world." After I

entered the school, the first drama I studied was a k'un drama about "an emperor presenting a gift to his lover in the palace of long life." At that time, some people said to me: "You are like a fine unglazed brick, singing the lead role; this is your first opera and you must lay a good foundation so that you will have a bright future." In order to study the part of Yang Kuei-fei, the emperor's concubine, I had to practice the spirit and manner of a noble lady, and my mouth was filled with such phrases like "Your Majesty makes me feel I am in paradise," phrases I could hardly understand. Just imagine how great a gap I had to fill, from wearing a red scarf to being Yang Kuei-fei, falling back from the stirring and seething of new China down to the courtly gates of the women's chambers--to be filled with feelings of affection for feudal emperors and kings! Thus, when I was still young and without much understanding, the black line in revisionist literature and art made use of this old drama school to give me my first "lesson" in the reactionary ideology of the landlord and bourgeois classes. Their objective in "educating" us youths in this way was just as Lenin had said: "to train them as slaves for the use of the bourgeoisie." Over those several years, we were poisoned by the bourgeois ideology of making our own way and of seeking fame and fortune and by that Confucian and Mencian stuff disseminated in the old plays; those of us who entered the school as innocent and carefree red scarves became dull and listless artists. My thinking changed. In order to study well to play famous roles, I pored over "traditional" operatic scripts about emperors, kings, generals, ministers, scholars and beauties from dawn until dusk. With insipid political fervor and removed from any relationship with other comrades, I seemed to show no concern for the Motherland's future and revolutionary ideals. Thus the old drama school led me onto the evil road of seeking bourgeois fame and gain.

After graduation, I was assigned to the Shanghai Youth Peking-K'un Opera Troupe (later re-named the Shanghai Youth Peking Opera Troupe). Under the domination of the "17 years'" revisionist black line in literature and art, literary and art circles became a large black dye vat, flooded by bourgeois ideology. To take a certain person as teacher, to pursue advanced studies, to go abroad--these became the goals sought after in the opera troupe. Subjected to the corrosion of bourgeois ideology, some around me degenerated and some made serious mistakes. I too had over-indulged and was unable to release myself from the deceptive spell of the "primacy of art," and even felt self-complacent about my ability to sing several leading roles. However, operas about emperors, kings, generals, ministers, scholars and beauties only serve and receive the applause of the bourgeoisie and basically are not what the broad masses of workers, peasants and soldiers want to see. Once when we performed "Visit to the Grave" and "Broken Bridge" and other operas in the suburbs of Shanghai, the poor and lower-middle peasants became very angry and sharply criticized us by saying: "You call yourselves a youth opera troupe and yet you still go all out to perform those old operas with their evil melodies; why can't you perform the new program of socialism"? This really shook my thinking. Still, just what the correct orientation was and what the revolutionary road should be remained rather unclear to me at that time. What on earth had we received from the "17 years'" revisionist black line in literature and art? It steeped us in the poison of feudalism, capitalism and revisionism, separated us from the workers, peasants and

soldiers and turned us youths into pampered spiritual aristocrats; it sought to make us sacrificial offerings for the old Peking opera, turn us into tools to restore capitalism and to undermine the foundations of socialism. Just look at this "17 years'" training; can it be that it was not carried out to trample under and poison us young people?

"With firm strides we are crossing its summit." In 1964, the great revolution in Peking opera began, and the tide of revolution swept over me and gradually made me realize that only when writers and artists took the road of serving the workers, peasants and soldiers, as pointed out by Chairman Mao, would they have a real future. In the battle of the proletarian revolution in literature and art, I once again took my first step. In 1971, I accepted the glorious responsibility for playing the role of K'o Hsiang in the modern revolutionary Peking opera "Azalea Mountain." I was so excited and eager that I wanted to play the part of K'o Hsiang all at once. At first, I thought after several years on the stage, my experience should stand me in good stead. But in fact, this was not so. The old ideas and old things not only failed to help me project the image of K'o Hsiang, but, on the contrary, became the greatest stumbling block to my progress.

First, I discovered my thoughts and feelings weren't right. Previously, I was accustomed to playing noble women and young ladies and now I was to play the role of a proletarian Party representative. My comrades were all worried that I might not be "temperamentally qualified" and I myself felt far removed from such a heroic character as K'o Hsiang. However, the "temperamental quality" of an actor or actress is not innate and can be transformed. The only way to change that "temperamental quality" given me by the old drama school was to follow the teaching of Chairman Mao: "/They/ must gradually move their feet over to the side of the workers, peasants, and soldiers, to the side of the proletariat, through the process of going into their very midst and into the thick of practical struggles and through the process of studying Marxism and society." The first place selected by the leadership in rehearsing "Azalea Mountain" was Chingkangshan. My comrades and I picked up our knapsacks and arrived at Taching, a place where Chairman Mao had lived before. There, together with the poor and lower-middle peasants, we began our fiery and militant life. Once, the poor and lower-middle peasants led us to climb up Huangyangchieh through a small path where Chairman Mao had walked carrying grain on a shoulder pole. We sat beneath an oak tree and listened to a story told by the poor and lower-middle peasants about how Commissar Mao taught the Red Army soldiers. At that time, Chairman Mao, standing on the same spot and pointing down to the range on range of mountain peaks that rose beneath his feet, taught the soldiers how they should view the whole of China and the whole world from Chingkangshan. The road opened up by Chairman Mao on Chingkangshan was the road to victory for the Chinese revolution. Chairman Mao's great revolutionary practice was quite an education for me. "Standing on a peak, one surveys around oneself." When we looked back over the road we had come, the road dominated by the "17 years'" black line in literature and art, how small it was! It was the Party, the great proletarian cultural revolution personally initiated and led by Chairman Mao, that led me onto the right path. I felt that if I did

not change my world outlook and did not root out the influence of the black line in literature and art on me, I would be unable to fulfill the task the Party assigned me, nor would I be worthy of the careful nurturing and the fervent expectations that the Party and Chairman Mao have for our younger generation.

Nonetheless, my road forward was not smooth and a fierce struggle between the two kinds of thinking became immediately apparent at rehearsals. For instance, in the course of rehearsing the scene "Solitary Rock in a Turbulent Stream," however I tried, I could not grasp K'o Hsiang's thoughts and feelings accurately. At first, I played it very seriously, thinking that such acting would have an impact. But the comrades criticized my performance as "dull and lifeless," saying "my face betrayed official airs and lacked proletarian feelings." Afterwards, I went to the other extreme, playing in an affectionate and ingratiating style, wholly abandoning myself to personal feelings. The comrades sharply criticized me again, pointing out that "with such a performance, K'o Hsiang's principled Party spirit could not be seen." Why did these two extremes show up in my performance? The reason was that I was still bedeviled by the artistic viewpoint and world outlook handed down to me by the old drama school; when I used bourgeois or petty bourgeois preconceptions to observe, analyze and understand the world of K'o Hsiang's inner being, it inevitably distorted her heroic image. Therefore, I once again studied the great works and splendid poems written by Chairman Mao during the period of the Chingkangshan struggle and came to a fairly clear understanding that with Communist Party members there was no contradiction between a highly principled Party character and profound proletarian feelings and when properly integrated they would be of outstanding quality. My original intention to play the part as either "stern" or "ingratiating" truly betrayed the petty bourgeois sentiments and necessarily had to be wholly abandoned as alien to K'o Hsiang's thoughts and feelings. It was only in this way that in this scene I gradually grasped the relationship between how K'o Hsiang enlightened people with Marxist-Leninist principles and how she moved them with proletarian sentiments, and then I began to make the proper adjustments to depict her inner being. This shows that if we want to discover the correct approach in artistic creation, we must take a new step and undergo a profound revolution in thinking.

While one must transform one's thinking, one must remodel oneself artistically. What I studied as a leading lady in the past required that "hands should not reveal wrists, smiles should not show teeth, nor movements the petticoat." To follow these rules in portraying the workers, peasants and soldiers basically wouldn't work. The art form of Peking opera can only "be transformed and added new content" under the guidance of the world outlook of the proletariat, and only then will it be possible to give off a brilliant new artistic vitality. Had the patterns I studied previously not thoroughly changed, I would be shackled hand and foot, not knowing where to put my hands nor which way to walk on the stage. If we want to play proletarian heroic characters well, artistically we must take the new road, not the old. I was unwilling to take the old road, yet neither was I able to take the new; I could only go on studying with all-out effort. The artistic arrangement for "Azalea Mountain" represented a new attempt to regulate the performance from various aspects, starting with the rhythm of the dialogue.

In order to train us, the leadership led us to take the workers, peasants and soldiers as our teachers and to draw nourishment from their tempestuous struggle in life. The poor and lower-middle peasants taught me by the hand how to plant paddy rice, harvest wheat, carry things by a shoulder pole, and what they knew about productive labor and class struggle. Throughout the rehearsal, the Party and my comrades thought out every method to help me overcome one artistic difficulty after another, enabling me to learn new things which I didn't learn in the old drama school. In the past my fighting skills were rather poor and now everyone came to help me practice the art of fighting. To help me make a move correctly, some comrades had to be thrown on the ground ten to twenty times a day. At first, the tone of my voice was not strong enough, but in the course of repeated help from the leadership and my group, my singing style was greatly changed. I learned vocalizing technique for combining true and falsetto singing and a method for enriching the tone. Thus I expanded and strengthened my power of expression. It may truly be said that the role of K'o Hsiang as I played it presented an image forged by the hands of a thousand people and a thousand beads of perspiration flowed with each melody; every motion of the hand, every pattern, word and tune were soaked through with the Party's life blood and made into a cohesive whole by the wisdom of the collective. Had we not made revolution in literature and art, we surely would not have the revolutionary and artistic youthfulness of this generation. Some people think that our achievements in the performing arts should be credited to "the account of merits" of the "17 years." Is this not to tell lies with eyes wide open? This "account of merits" of the "17 years'" black line in literature and art, about which the bourgeoisie speak with such relish, is none other than a wicked record of the feudal, bourgeois and revisionist literature and art which they promote, an account by which they vainly hope to restore capitalism. If this account was not settled, there would not be the spring of the hundred flowers of socialist literature and art blooming together as we have today.

When we think back over the painful lessons of the "17 years" and view the splendid gains won in the 10 years since the great cultural revolution, how can we workers in revolutionary literature and art help but be filled with emotion? We should not look back and surely cannot allow a repetition of the history of those "17 years." We must take class struggle as the key link, take practical action to safeguard the model revolutionary theatrical works and the fruits won in the great proletarian cultural revolution. At present, the struggle is fiercely continuing and we must constantly raise our vigilance and actively plunge into the struggle to hit back at the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts. On the revolutionary journey of literature and art, I have taken only the first step, but I am resolved to take the second and the third step, and go forward forever along Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in literature and art!

* * *

"In Nature Winds and Clouds Are Predictable"

by

Ch'iu Hsiang-ch'ün (邱何群)

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

People living on this earth are constantly dealing with the atmosphere surrounding the earth. Impelled by the needs of class and production struggles, people have steadily increased their understanding of nature and gained much knowledge about the laws of weather changes. People blowing the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts negate the role of the laboring people's social practice in developing science, but history tells us that it is precisely the laboring people who have incessantly pushed the progress of meteorology in the course of class and production struggles. With the advance of society and the development of production, the ever developing meteorology has led to an increasingly profound understanding of the laws governing atmospheric movement. The old saying that "in nature winds and clouds are unpredictable" is being replaced by the new understanding that "in nature winds and clouds are predictable."

I.

With a long history, meteorology originated from the practice of agricultural and pastoral production by the ancient laboring people, who founded the ancient meteorology. In order to carry out agricultural and pastoral production, it was necessary to understand the relationship of the growth of plants and animal life with weather changes. In the lengthy course of production activities, the laboring people made detailed observations year after year of the growth of vegetation, wild life activity and the characteristics of other changes in nature in order to know the weather changes in one year and use this knowledge to guide their production. In China, knowledge concerning the changes of the four seasons was gained very long ago, and the 24 seasonal periods were gradually summed up and differentiated. In the oracle-bone scriptures found in the ruined towns of Yin in 1400 B.C.--1200 B.C., there was already a dozen or so of meteorological terms such as fine, cloudy, haze, fog, rainbow, color clouds, frost and hail. Moreover, there were records of sunrise and frequent mentions of the word season, indicating that there was already the concept of four seasons at that time. By the Warring States period, names of the 24 seasonal periods were available. To meet the needs of developing production, each seasonal period was later divided into 3 hou, with each hou lasting 5 days. In each hou the weather situation, animal and plant ecology and other natural phenomena were observed and recorded. The 24 seasonal periods and the 72 hou reflected the weather changes, the characteristics of the growth and activity of wild animals and plants in various periods in a year as well as their relationship with agricultural activity. It was a comprehensive agricultural calendar summed up by the laboring people through their prolonged production practice and which up to now is still of vital significance in guiding agricultural production.

The seasonal periods and sub-periods (hou) reflect the general weather situation in various periods. Agricultural production also calls for mastery of the law of weather changes in various periods and the forecasting of those changes. The ancient laboring people in the course of production summed up the relationships between various kinds of heavenly and physical phenomena and the weather variation and expressed them in vivid and simple language. These were the weather proverbs used to forecast the weather. China is one of the earliest countries to employ weather proverbs. Long ago in the Book of Odes, it was recorded that "when a rainbow appears in the west in the morning, it will rain before noon." After the Han dynasty, with the further development of agricultural production, weather proverbs began to be assembled in book form, and there appeared such works as Proverbs for the Farmer. By the T'ang dynasty, weather proverbs forecasting rain were compiled into Book On Rain Forecasting. The Five Essentials for Agriculture during the Ming dynasty was a big collection of weather proverbs, with more than ten classifications covering more than 300 proverbs, and might be looked upon as one of the most detailed works of its kind in the world. Subsequently, further progress was achieved. Apart from the use of poetry and prose as forms to express weather proverbs, the Three-Lights Illustrations Presented by the White Ape handed down from the late-Ming and early-Ch'ing period contained more than 130 drawings of clouds to explain the laws of weather changes, and much of its content was quite consistent with the principles of modern meteorology. In other parts of the world there appeared also many works on weather proverbs, such as the Book of Symptoms of ancient Greece, the Essentials of Navigation of 15th century Japan, and the Rules of the Banbury Herdsman of 18th-century England. These weather proverbs were very extensive in scope and extremely rich in content; they were summation of the practical experience of the vast masses of laboring people in their prolonged struggle against nature, the crystallization of the collective wisdom of peasants, herdsmen, fishermen and sailors.

Among the weather proverbs circulated throughout China, some reflected the weather conditions of a certain locality or in a certain season. For instance, "if the wind blows from the west in the morning and from the east in the evening, the earth will be dry, making the fields difficult to plow," indicating the changes of the wind from the sea and from inland in one day under fine weather conditions along China's eastern coastal region. "In the seasonal period of the Minor Heat, if the southly wind blows for 18 mornings in a row, wood cut in the morning may be used as faggot in the afternoon"--this describes the characteristics of the weather under the control of a dry and hot macroscopic air mass in the summer season. "Summer rains make a difference even on a buffalo's back" graphically depicts what it was like with summer thunder showers. Then there were such proverbs forecasting weather variation as "when the sun sets into a cave of dark clouds, the next morning the scorching sun will burn your back" and "when the clouds move east, horse wagons can take the road, ... when the clouds move north, wheat may be sunned well." Some looked forward to the prospects of production, such as "if you need three quilts to keep warm when the wheat is sown, you can expect a bumper harvest that will fill your pillow with bread," and so forth. "Plowing," "cutting wood," "drying wheat," and "the buffalo's back"--these and other similar terms are a true portrayal of the production activities of the laboring people, a clear indication that the authors of these weather proverbs are none other than the broad masses of the laboring people. In the course of their production

activities, the laboring people gradually came to understand some laws governing climatic phenomena and changes, summed them up into weather proverbs, spread and applied them among the masses, and continued to enrich them in practice. These weather proverbs, refined by the laboring people in the course of practice--knowledge--again practice, have for a very long time been an effective weapon for the laboring people in transforming nature. Even down to this day, the great amount of experience as expressed by these proverbs is still playing an important role in raising the accuracy of regional weather forecasting. These historical facts eloquently prove that the laboring people are the main force in establishing meteorology. Shouldn't those who believe that in science and technology inventions and discoveries are made only by a few scientists of "genius" draw some enlightenment from this?

The achievements of China's ancient meteorology cover many aspects, of which the invention and improvement of weather observation instruments is an important one. Very long ago China had already invented a kind of wind cone made of birds' feather. The wind forecasting bronze bird built on top of the Ch'angan Lingt'ai (the Observatory of Eternal Peace) in the Han dynasty was one of the world's earliest fixed wind measuring instruments. In the Nine Chapters on Mathematics by Ch'in Chiu-shao of the Southern Sung dynasty, there were such mathematical problems as "the heavenly pond to measure rain" and "bamboo vessels to measure snow," showing that instruments for the measurement of rain and snow were already in use in various parts of the country before the Southern Sung dynasty, whereas in Europe the idea of such rain gauges did not arise until about 400 years later. In 200 b.c. the Chinese people already made humidity measurement by means of the weight of charcoal, bearing in mind that "in dry weather the charcoal is light while in wet weather, it is heavy." In Europe, however, it was not until the 15th century that similar methods were devised to determine air humidity on the basis of the weight of wool. The instrument for measuring cold and heat and the instrument for measuring dryness and humidity invented by Huang Lü-chuang of the Ch'ing dynasty were instruments with even greater sensitivity. According to records, "in the instrument for measuring dryness and humidity was a needle which could turn both to the left and the right. If the weather was dry, it would turn to the left, and if it was wet, it would turn to the right. It had a high degree of precision and could also forecast whether the weather would be overcast or fine." It was very much like the modern hair hygroscope. As to China's records of meteorological data, they are rare in the world both in terms of the length of time and of the richness of content. They are extremely valuable material for the study of weather changes. The laboring people in ancient China not only made many important contributions in the field of weather forecasting, but also were in the forefront in controlling the weather. As early as the late-17th century, it was already recorded that the people of Kansu succeeded in using fire cannon to bombard hail clouds and eliminating hail by artificial means.

"Truth develops through its struggle against falsehood." Standing opposed to this mainstream of meteorology founded by the laboring people in the course of production practice, the reactionary ruling classes and their hired scholars, in order to defend their decadent rule, always made use of meteorological phenomena, which people still felt "mysterious and

unpredictable," to vigorously advocate the theory of Heavenly will and led meteorology to the wrong path of idealist theology. Their preposterous views and evil doctrines were not only opposed and spurned by the laboring people, but were also criticized by some progressive thinkers. In ancient China, the Legalists who favored reform and progress, in their struggle against Confucian restoration and regression, criticized the theory of Heavenly will and transcendentalism preached by the Confucianists and offered materialist interpretations to weather phenomena, thereby providing an impetus to the development of meteorology. For instance, the Legalist Wang Ch'ung of Eastern Han criticized the superstitious belief--advocated by the Confucianists--that rain was a gift from Heaven and one should pray to Heaven for rain. He clearly pointed out that rain was water evaporated into the air from the ground and then dropped back onto the ground. He also refuted the Confucian nonsense that "thunder represents Heaven's wrath," pointing out: "Thunder is the sudden burst of air from the sun." He went on to explain the changes in thunder during a year with the seasonal changes of solar radiation. Since the Legalists laid emphasis on agriculture and war, they directed more attention to the production practice of the masses. Their writings summed up the practical experience of a great number of laboring people. For instance, Meng-chi Pi-t'an /Random Notes by a Dream Brook/ written by the Sung Legalist Shen Kuo, summed up the experience of the masses in observing the sky and forecasting the weather. It is clear that the laboring masses were the main force in creating science, but the reactionary ruling classes did their utmost to downgrade and strangle the scientific achievements of the laboring people. Those representatives of the reactionary declining classes, the disciples of Confucius and Mencius, in ancient China, despised the weather proverbs the laboring people expressed in simple and plain language as well as their inventions and creations, and disdained to record them in historical annals. Today, those advocates of the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts who worship the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius likewise despise the workers, peasants and soldiers and vainly attempt to turn them away from the gate of scientific research. "The lowly are most intelligent; the elite are most ignorant!" The colossal contributions made by the vast masses of laboring people in the course of developing meteorology are a powerful rebuttal against those strange arguments of theirs.

II.

As weather proverbs usually summed up the laws of weather changes observed in a relatively small region, there were certain limitations when they were used for weather forecasting. After the 16th century, in the wake of the great social change marked by the replacement of the feudal system by the capitalist system in Europe, meteorology also advanced from the stage of ancient weather proverbs to that of the modern weather map in violent class struggle.

The weather map, also known as the comprehensive survey map, is a map marked with unified symbols showing the meteorological records and weather conditions such as temperature, humidity, atmospheric pressure and wind velocity observed simultaneously by many meteorological stations in various regions. These are studied comprehensively in order to determine the trends of weather changes. While weather proverbs reflect largely laws of a local nature, weather maps make it possible to study atmospheric movement as a whole and on a relatively larger scale. While weather proverbs are summed up from fixed observation of various natural and physical

phenomena mainly by relying on man's sensory organs, weather maps make it possible to conduct scientific analysis of weather phenomena in a manner more conformable to objective reality on the basis of observation data obtained from meteorological instruments and by the application of knowledge derived from such developed sciences as physics and mathematics. With weather maps, people are able to make comprehensive comparisons of weather phenomena and changes as observed in different localities, facilitating the gradual elevation of a large amount of perceptual experience at hand to the level to rational analysis. In this way, our knowledge of the atmosphere has become far more systematic and complete, laying the foundation for weather forecasting over a large area.

How, then,did weather maps appear? In the bourgeoisie's annals of meteorology, the credit goes either to this professor of mathematics or to that astronomer. Actually, had it not been for the fact that the laboring people pushed the development of production to a relatively high level and the various branches of science and technology were developed correspondingly, preparing the necessary material and technical conditions for the establishment of a unified meteorological observation network, no "genius" or "scholar" could possibly produce a weather map out of his own imagination. Engels pointed out: "If, after the dark night of the Middle Ages was over, the sciences suddenly arose anew with undreamed-of force, developing at a miraculous rate, once again we owe this miracle to production." (Dialectics of Nature) As in other branches of science, the appearance of the weather map in the history of meteorology must be "owed to production."

The idea of using meteorological data gathered in many places to study atmospheric movement with a unified approach was conceived long ago. According to China's historical records, at the turn of the 18th century, the Ch'ing emperor K'anghsi "frequently put up small flags to assess the wind and ordered all provinces to report all occurrences of wind and rain. He noticed that if there was wind from the northwest over the capital on a certain day, wind would be blowing from the southeast in Shantung the same day." Accordingly the old saying that "winds do not blow in the same direction beyond another li" was established. This was the earliest sprout of the idea of weather maps, and there was the concept of discontinuity of wind direction. This was indeed quite an achievement at that time. However, in those days China was still a feudal society; the small-scale production and exchange activities of the small peasant economy did not give rise to the social need for knowing the laws of weather over a large area, and could not possibly provide the objective conditions for the establishment of a unified observation network.

In Europe, from the late 18th century to the early 19th century, the development of capitalist production, the growth of industry, trade, and especially ocean shipping, gave rise to an increasingly urgent need for knowing the laws of weather changes over a large area, and provided the necessary material conditions for doing so. As a result, some European capitalist countries successively set up meteorological observation networks. In 1820, the German Brandes collected meteorological data from these observation networks by correspondence and for the first time produced a historical weather map. Although it was valuable to the study of the laws of weather changes, it was after all a "dead" weather map and could not be used directly for weather forecasting. At that time, quite a number of people were thinking

that if daily "live" weather maps could be produced, it would be possible to make weather forecasts promptly and to prevent disasters caused by storms. But due to lack of high-speed communications equipment, such a wish could not be realized. Not until the invention of the telegraph was the first weather map produced on the same day data was collected by telegraph in the mid-19th century. Displayed at the London Museum, this map attracted many people and caused quite a stir. However, at that time the map played only the role of a commercial advertisement and still could not be used for practical weather forecasting. This was because the maintenance of observation activities of a large unified observation network and the prompt transmission of meteorological data and weather information by means of telecommunications required enormous amounts of money and manpower as well as the cooperation of telecommunications and news departments, and this was far beyond the reach of any individual or even meteorological academic body. In those days, some scientists such as Lamarck of France proposed to their governments the establishment by the state of special meteorological institutions to take charge of such enormously complex scientific work as the collection of meteorological data and weather forecasting. However, the bourgeoisie withheld their support on the ground that it was an expensive and unrewarding undertaking. At that time the French rulers turned down Lamarck's suggestion, saying "don't do such a futile thing; you'd better carry on your biological research."

In 1854, the contention for the Middle East between England and France, and Imperial Russia led to the Crimea War. On November 14, the Anglo-French fleet was hit by a sudden violent storm, which sank the French capital ship "Henry IV." The tremendous military and economic losses greatly shocked the French rulers, and the minister of the navy ordered an investigation into the causes of the incident. The director of the Paris Observatory Lefebvre (列佛利) drew a weather chart on the basis of available meteorological data and discovered that the storm was a low pressure, which a few days earlier had already appeared over Western Europe and then moved eastward to the Black Sea across the Mediterranean along an orderly path. His investigation proved that it was entirely possible to predict the advent of the storm to avert the disaster that befell the fleet. Accordingly, Lefebvre proposed the establishment of a national meteorological service, and the proposal was immediately accepted by the government. So in 1860, the French Meteorological Bureau came into being, and beginning from 1863, it used weather charts to issue storm warnings to various major ports and harbors.

From the birth of the first weather chart to the application of weather charts for practical weather forecasting, more than 40 years of twists and turns were experienced. Historical facts eloquently confirmed Engels' brilliant thesis: "Once society has a technical need, then such a need can push science forward with a force greater than ten universities." But just as Engels said, "it is a pity that when writing the history of science, people used to take science as something that drops from the sky." ("Engels to W. Borgius") Such an idealist conception of history still sways the heads of certain people down to this day. In 1973, at the meeting commemorating the contennial of the International Meteorological Organization, there were still people who declared that modern meteorology "was founded by those pure researchers, physicists and astronomers interested in the

atmosphere and its movements." Such a view is obviously a distortion of the history of meteorology. Without the objective demands generated by the development of production on meteorology and without the material conditions provided by production for the development of meteorology, the interest of scientists can only be utopian. The astronomer Lefebvre collected meteorological data from various regions and drew weather maps not because he suddenly felt interested in atmospheric activity, but because of the sinking of "Henry IV." Since weather maps were used for weather forecasting, quite a number of scientists produced new principles and methods of weather forecasting, which were based on a great flow of meteorological data provided by meteorological stations widely distributed in various regions. These networks were built to meet the needs of production, and their building was guaranteed by the meteorological instruments and equipment that could be provided by the level of development of production at the time. If the link between meteorology and production were cut off, it would have been impossible for meteorology to develop and forge ahead.

III.

"New things always have to experience difficulties and setbacks as they grow." This is also the case with the further development of modern meteorology, whose every major advance was the result of breaking with old traditional concepts and fighting against idealism and metaphysics.

After the invention of the barometer in the 17th century, people discovered the close connection between weather variation and changes in atmospheric pressure. When atmospheric pressure dropped, the weather would usually be bad, and if it rose, the weather would often be fine. Therefore, the role of atmospheric pressure was stressed, and the barometer was once referred to as the "meter for foretelling fine and rainy weather" and "the eye-glasses of weather." After the appearance of weather maps, people in the course of practice of weather forecasting linked the points of the same atmospheric pressure into a curve. After drawing such an isobaric line, they discovered that the geographical distribution of weather had an extremely close relationship with the horizontal distribution of atmospheric pressure. In 1885, the Englishman Abercromby (阿勃科克贝) summed up these experiences and advanced a new principle of weather forecasting on the basis of the shape of the isobaric line--"isobar meteorology." As it provided a simple method of weather forecasting, it was seriously heeded and welcomed, and was applied extensively. Since then, among the many factors affecting weather variation, the role of atmospheric pressure was especially emphasized. Weather forecasting which was to be based on a comprehensive analysis of the various factors turned into forecasting purely based on the shape of the isobaric line and the mechanical application of an existing model. This was a metaphysical method of making one-sided and isolated observation of problems. This method prevented people from deeply understanding the essence of weather changes and resulted in the fall of accuracy in weather forecasting. The prevalence and domination of this metaphysical method of thought caused meteorology to be stagnant for nearly half a century.

The first to break this impasse was a group of revolutionary North European meteorologists headed by V. Bjerknes in Norway. Norway, which had just won its independence at the turn of the 20th century, was beset with difficulties caused by the blockade of meteorological information imposed by the major belligerent countries. In order to safeguard its own fishery and shipping operations, it was necessary to have more accurate weather forecasting. So, many new meteorological stations were built in the Norwegian soil and on its off-shore islands. The number of newly added stations was eleven times that of existing stations. With the readings acquired from so dense a meteorological observation network, the Norwegian meteorologists conducted a fairly profound and meticulous analysis of weather phenomena. They discovered that there existed in the atmosphere great air masses which possessed relatively uniform physical properties and which horizontally extended several thousand kilometers. Between the cold air masses and the warm air masses with different properties there was a very narrow boundary surface on which the various meteorological elements changed most violently and such weather phenomena as clouds and rains were primarily concentrated. It was then discovered that not all low pressure systems resulted in storms and those that really did were largely low pressures connected with this surface. This they called a frontal cyclone. Summarizing a set of theories on frontal cyclones based on practice, they broke through the old and petrified "isobar weather theory" and established a new method for weather analysis and forecasting. When rational theoretical explanations were given to many important facts about the weather, the understanding of the laws of weather evolution was further deepened, so that meteorology, which had been stagnant for half a century, was back to life again. This major breakthrough in the history of modern meteorology was undoubtedly due to the supply of detailed materials from a dense network of stations established to meet the needs of production; in terms of method of thinking, practice had broken the bondage of the metaphysical method. These North European meteorologists did not take a one-sided approach to the state of atmospheric pressure, but, from an analysis of the relationship between the two kinds of air masses having different properties in the atmosphere, saw the opposition and struggle between the two and that this struggle gave rise to violent weather changes. Thus they were able to acquire a more thoroughgoing understanding of the essence of weather changes, and from then on meteorology leaped to a new stage.

However, because "the new process contains new contradictions," a series of new struggles began. The frontal theory made it possible to considerably raise the rate of accuracy of short-term weather forecasting in the mid-latitude region, but then some people made the theory absolute. In their analysis of air masses, they embarked on the wrong path of scholastic classifications in isolation from reality. There were also some people who mechanically applied without analysis to low latitude regions this method which had proved effective in mid-latitude regions, with the result that wrong conclusions were reached. All of this hindered the healthy development of meteorology. It also showed that idealism and metaphysics constituted a reactionary world outlook hindering the development of science.

Due to the complexity of the atmospheric movement itself, today men's understanding of the atmospheric movement still has not reached the point where they can forecast the weather with complete accuracy or control the weather in separate localities with certainty. At present, the application of man-made earth satellites, electronic computers and other

devices to meteorology has made the accumulation of meteorological materials, the exchange of information, the processing of great amounts of data, and even weather forecasting increasingly more mechanical and automatic. The introduction of various kinds of new techniques provides unprecedentedly favorable conditions for the development of meteorology. However, following the development of modern meteorology, science has been divided into increasingly specialized branches, which objectively tend to encourage the growth of the metaphysical method of thinking, such as, for example, confining oneself to the study of a certain aspect of science while neglecting the need to make overall, comprehensive analysis of the atmospheric movement; paying attention only to form classification while failing to probe into the physical essence of the atmospheric movement; over-emphasizing the role of machines and neglecting the human factor and the importance of the experience of the forecasters and the masses. All of this is a manifestation of metaphysical thinking under new conditions, and if this is not noted and corrected, it is bound to pose new obstacles to the development of meteorology.

The twists and turns and struggles in the development of modern meteorology have convincingly illustrated the importance for natural science workers to embrace a correct world outlook. Engels pointed out long ago: "Natural scientists may adopt whatever attitude they please, they are still under the domination of philosophy. It is only a question whether they want to be dominated by a bad, fashionable philosophy or by a form of theoretical thought which rests on acquaintance with the history of thought and its achievements." (Dialectics of Nature) Engels also repeatedly reminded natural science workers to "be aware of metaphysics!" However, those who are presently stirring up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts depart from these incisive warnings and, under the pretext that Marxism cannot replace natural science, oppose the guidance of Marxism over natural science. By so doing, as Engels pointed out, they want to sway the heads of natural science workers with a bad, fashionable philosophy. Historical experience merits attention. We natural science workers must be alert against such revisionist absurdities and must not be taken in by them. We must study Marxism conscientiously and make every effort to "be a conscious defender of materialism represented by Marx, a dialectical materialist." (Lenin, "On the Significance of Militant Materialism")

IV.

In ancient times the Chinese laboring people made outstanding, brilliant contributions to the development of meteorology. In modern times, imperialist aggression and the reactionary rule of the Kuomintang greatly undermined our meteorological undertaking. There were only a few meteorological stations, and most of them were dominated by the imperialists and used to serve their aggression against and plundering of China. The whole meteorological enterprise being in such a state, there was of course even less room for the development of meteorology as a science. In those days our country's meteorology was on the verge of death.

"Revolution is the locomotive of history." The great victory of the new democratic revolution led by Chairman Mao and the Chinese Communist Party and the establishment of socialist new China gave a new life to China's

meteorological service and meteorological science. Especially since the great proletarian cultural revolution, meteorological work has developed rapidly. In sharp contrast to the depressing scene before the liberation, meteorological stations are now scattered all over the country from the hinterland to the frontier areas. In terms of the number of stations and density, China has joined the front ranks of the world. The class nature of a socialist state under the dictatorship of the proletariat determines the basic nature of China's meteorological service. Contrary to the imperialist orientation of serving aggression and plunder, China's meteorological service seeks to protect the people, first and foremost the laboring people. For this reason, the work of forecasting disastrous weather receives serious attention from the Party and government and becomes the focal point of our meteorological work. We have already established a modern typhoon surveillance network, greatly reducing the damage caused by typhoons. Forecasting such disastrous weather as cold waves, gales, rainstorms and hail has also played a remarkable role in the struggle against natural calamities. Under the leadership of Chairman Mao and the Chinese Communist Party, the laboring people have brought their wisdom into full play. During the great leap forward of 1958, with the establishment of the people's commune, meteorological observation posts in the countryside emerged like spring bamboo shoots after rain to serve the great leap forward in agricultural production. The broad masses and meteorological workers, combining mass meteorological experience, ancient meteorological knowledge and the principle of modern meteorology, created China's unique single-station weather forecasting method. This greatly raised the rate of accuracy of meteorological forecasting and enabled it to reach the advanced level of the world. However, due to the interference and sabotage by Liu Shao-ch'i's revisionist line before the great cultural revolution, the advance of China's meteorological service and meteorological science was affected and hindered.

Through the great proletarian cultural revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, the vast numbers of meteorological workers have severely criticized the revisionist lines of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, implemented the principle of independence and self-reliance, and carried out the policy of making meteorological work serve proletarian politics and the workers, peasants and soldiers and integrating it with productive labor. As a result, an excellent situation marked by flourishing development and growing prosperity has appeared in the sphere of meteorology. In recent years, in such fields as disastrous weather forecasting, highland meteorology, tropical meteorology, satellite meteorology, radar meteorology, numerical forecasting, statistical forecasting, climatic variation, artificial rain and hail elimination by artificial means, relatively great progress and gratifying results have been achieved both in practice and in theory, with new contributions made to the national economy and national defense construction.

Recalling the development of meteorology, especially that of China's own, and summing up historical experiences enable us to look to the future with still greater confidence. Indeed, "the scenery is best on this side." In contrast to those pessimistic views about "the arrival of a glacial period," "world famine," and "destruction of mankind" prevailing in the moribund and declining capitalist society, we believe that "in nature winds and clouds are predictable" and that "man will surely triumph over nature!" We are convinced that, under the leadership of Chairman Mao and the

Chinese Communist Party, and by taking class struggle as the key link, adhering to the Party's basic line, and implementing a series of principles, policies and instructions laid down by Chairman Mao, we shall be able to push the meteorological science to new heights and make greater contributions to China's socialist revolution and construction. But people stirring up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts in educational and scientific-technological circles refuse to recognize the exceedingly favorable situation that has developed since the start of the great proletarian cultural revolution, oppose the exercising of all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie by the proletariat and the leadership of the Party over scientific-technological work; they oppose the occupation of the scientific-technological position by Marxism and its guidance over scientific research. They oppose the integration between scientific-technological personnel and the workers and peasants and between scientific-technological work and large-scale mass movement. The history of meteorology strongly rebuts their bourgeois, revisionist viewpoints. The struggle to repel the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts is a grave struggle between the two classes, two roads and two lines, with a bearing on the future and destiny of our Party and country. We scientific-technological workers must actively fight under the leadership of the Party, thoroughly criticize this revisionist line contradicting Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, and win greater victories in socialist revolution and construction. In the course of this great struggle, China's meteorological work is bound to experience new development and make new and greater contributions to the Chinese people and the people of the world.

* * *

Reversing Correct Verdicts Goes Against the Will of the People*

- Jen-min Jih-pao Editorial -

(Hung-ch'i /Red Flag/, No. 4, April 1, 1976)

Under the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, a great struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts is triumphantly developing throughout the country.

Our great leader Chairman Mao recently pointed out: "Reversing correct verdicts goes against the will of the people." Chairman Mao's words have fully expressed the strong desire of the revolutionary people to combat restoration and regression and to persevere in continuing the revolution and exposed the reactionary nature of the unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party who goes against the trend of history. They are an inspiration to the whole Party, the whole army and the people of the whole country to take a still more active part in the struggle against the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts.

This struggle was provoked by the bourgeoisie. The Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts was stirred up around last summer. Those doing this opposed taking class struggle as the key link, tampered with the Party's basic line, negated the proletarian revolution in eduation and in literature and art and the sociaist revolution in the field of science and technology; they negated the three-in-one combination of the old, the middle-aged and the young, the new socialist things on various fronts and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, and they tried to reverse the correct appraisal of the Cultural Revolution and settle accounts with it. They had theory and a program to guide their organized activities in reversing correct verdicts. They directed their spearhead at our great leader Chairman Mao, at his revolutionary line and at the masses of revolutionary people. If this Right deviationist wind is not rebuffed and beaten back, would it not be tantamount to tolerating the spread of revisionism unchecked and the restoration of capitalism?

The mass revolutionary debate that started in Tsinghua University has dealt this Right deviationist wind a head-on blow; this has won the hearts of the people as well as enthusiastic support and acclaim from the people of all nationalities in the country. The revolutionary masses and revolutionary cadres have earnestly studied the experience of Tsinghua University and, under the leadership of the Party, criticized "taking the three directives as the key link," thereby completely isolating the capitalist-roaders in the Party who stirred up the Right deviationist wind. Facts prove that the workers, peasants and soldiers, revolutionary cadres and revolutionary intellectuals, that is, the people who account for over 95 percent of the total population, want revolution and support socialism. They do not want to be oppressed by bigwigs who practice revisionism. Their basic desire is

---

* This translation is reproduced from Peking Review, No. 11, Mar. 12, 1976. - SPRCM Ed.

to take the socialist road, and the great proletarian cultural revolution represents their fundamental interests. They want to consolidate and expand the fruits of victory of the great proletarian cultural revolution, restrict bourgeois right and advance the socialist revolution. To practice revisionism and reverse the correct appraisal of the great cultural revolution will never be approved by the masses of the people.

Chairman Mao recently pointed out: "With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the cooperative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticizing bourgeois right, they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party--those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road." This incisive Marxist-Leninist analysis by Chairman Mao has summed up the historical experience of China's socialist revolution over the past 20 years and more, and it has defended and developed Marxism-Leninism. It is a powerful ideological weapon for us in combating and preventing revisionism, a powerful ideological weapon for us in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Chairman Mao clearly indicates here that the capitalist roaders are precisely the bourgeoisie in the Party during the period of socialist revolution. From the cooperative movement to the criticism of bourgeois right, every step forward in the socialist revolution has met with resistance from the bourgeoisie in the Party. Since in socialist society, there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggle and there still are the soil and the conditions engendering capitalism and the bourgeoisie, capitalist roaders or new representatives of the bourgeoisie will inevitably appear in the Party, and the phenomenon that "the capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road" will continue to exist for a long time. The person who stirred up the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts is precisely the capitalist roader who followed Liu Shao-ch'i in practicing revisionism and opposed all the socialist revolutionary movements before the cultural revolution and who was criticized in the cultural revolution but has refused to mend his ways. In words, he stated "I'll never reverse the verdict," but once he took up work again, he relapsed into error and continued to take the capitalist road. Persons like him have never been Marxists but are bourgeois democrats with their ideology, as Chairman Mao pointed out, remaining at the stage of the democratic revolution. Like Sung Chiang in the novel Water Margin who, though having joined the ranks of the peasant insurgents, still represents the landlord class, the capitalist roaders are "Communists" in name but actually representatives of the old and new bourgeoisie within and outside the Party. We must bear in mind that throughout the historical period of socialism, the principal contradiction is the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the main danger is revisionism, and the target of the revolution is the bourgeoisie, mainly those in power in the Party taking the capitalist road.

The struggle initiated and led by Chairman Mao to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts concerns the future and destiny of our Party and state. After every great historical social change, there inevitably are persons like Confucius who came out and tried to turn things back and restore the old order. Such persons are bound to appear in great revolutions such as the great proletarian cultural revolution. The

current struggle between reversing correct verdicts and opposing the reversal, between restoring the old order and combating restoration, is a continuation and deepening of the struggle between Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line and the counter-revolutionary revisionist line of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, and a continuation and deepening of the great proletarian cultural revolution. Such struggles will go on in the future, and we must be sober-minded about this.

The struggle against the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts is being carried out under the leadership of the Party committees at various levels. Do not establish ties and do not organize fighting groups. It is essential to conscientiously study the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, study Chairman Mao's theses on classes, class contradictions and class struggle since the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and his important instructions on the great proletarian cultural revolution and on the counter-attack on the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts, and get a clear understanding of the character, target, tasks and prospects of the socialist revolution. Leading cadres should stand in the van of the movement and take the lead in study, exposure and criticism and in the counter-attack against the Right deviationist wind. It is necessary to have faith in the masses, rely on the masses and boldly arouse the masses, and firmly grasp the main orientation of struggle; unite, and focus the criticism on the revisionist line of that capitalist roader who refuses to mend his ways. The revolutionary masses and revolutionary cadres must bear in mind Chairman Mao's teachings "help more people by educating them and narrow the target of attack" and "learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones and cure the sickness to save the patient." With regard to the small number of leading cadres who have carried out the erroneous line, it is essential to help them change their class stand and encourage them to correct their mistakes. We should adhere to the principle "grasp revolution, promote production and other work and preparedness against war," do a better job in all work including industrial and agricultural production, be vigilant against class enemies trying to make trouble and against those trying to sabotage production to undermine revolution. It is necessary to continue, through the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts, to promote stability and unity and consolidate and develop the great achievements of the great cultural revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius.

Under the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, let us take class struggle as the key link and carry the struggle against the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts through to the end!

(Originally carried in Jen-min Jih-pao, March 10, 1976)

* * *

END

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service
Springfield, Va. 22161

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PRINTED MATTER

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COM-211

CMP X761231 001
UNIV ILLINOIS LIB AT CHICAGO CIRCLE
LIB SERIALS SEC
BOX 8198
CHICAGO IL 60680